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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I note that it is a revised version and that the authors have responded to the previous reviewers. The research presented here is about the knowledge and awareness of HPV and HPV vaccination in adolescents. They show that a lecture has a lasting effect on knowledge, awareness, and intention to vaccinate with a one-year follow-up.

Major comments:

1. The quality of the writing seems to have improved (although the editing and proof reading is very poor). You may wish to add that support to your acknowledgements.

2. Always state p-values exactly, not as p<0.05, and always include enough information about the numbers and the outcome measures for awareness in the abstract.

3. I don't know how old students are in junior middle school. Please specify when first describing the classroom sampling. I note later that students are about 12?

4. There seems to have been a significant difference between the control and intervention groups before the intervention for the main outcome. Does this mean the sampling was biased or underpowered (9 intervention classes and 9 control classes)?

5. Report the exact p-values for each odds ratio unless they are below 0.001 or whatever the journal standard suggests. p<0.05 is not appropriate.

6. The "numbers do not add up due to missing data" is not clear - is this because of loss to follow-up or incomplete survey answers? It would be important to look at how many students were available for follow-up after 12 months.

Minor comments:

1. The acronym PPT is not defined the abstract. The acronym HPV is not defined in the abstract.
2. In the background, it seems unusual to use the $10^5$ notation rather than explaining the incidence of cervical cancer per hundred thousand women.

3. Be consistent with the spacing near references (see [8,9]).

4. The numbering in the paragraph (the circles with the numbers inside) on the baseline survey is unlikely to be published in that form. I suggest removing them from the background and later in the manuscript too. They really distract from the writing.

5. When producing manuscripts, always left-justify so reviewers and editors can check for spacing issues. Don't use left-right justification.

6. Grammatical errors: "and the rest 4 were the interventional classes" "(e.g. a student reported never hearing of HPV vaccines knew HPV vaccines useful for prevention of cervical cancer)" and "After this, the database was ready for final analysis." "However, although the low awareness on cervical cancer, HPV and its vaccines was found, the willingness to accept HPV vaccination was high" "

7. Table 1: Capital G for Girls.

8. Instead of ORadj just use "adjusted OR: " because there are problems with some being subscripts and others not. Take care to check manuscripts before submission. Errors in manuscript editing make reviewers assume the research is also full of errors.

9. Check spacing around punctuation, such as extra spaces before full stops, extra parentheses "((" and other sloppy editing "July2016" and "china". Spend the extra time to fix these errors when you first submit manuscripts - it creates unnecessary delays and substantially increases the risk of good research being rejected. A couple of hours of work up front will save weeks or months of delays later.

10. In the references, use a consistent format for the journals instead of having some abbreviated, some lower case, some upper case, etc.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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