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Reviewer’s report:

This is an important area - validating technology in low resource settings to ensure effectiveness and quality of care in the prevention of cervical cancer. The rates are increasing and will continue to do so in LMIC unless feasible and effective programmes to screen and treat can be delivered.

The study compares the use of a unocular system (it is not clarified that this is not a binocular fixed colposcope) with a trained colposcopists on site and transmission of still images using mobile phone technology for remote assessment.

The background should set out clearly why live versus static images and their accuracy for detecting CIN2+ is an issue.

The strengths are number of cases and biopsies to ascertain disease in all cases.

Limitations:

Only one colposcopists viewing dynamic images

No consistency in images as described and number of images per case which could affect performance in either direction. 376 images from 94 women. Can you provide data on the number of images per women median/mean and range. was there any correlation between number of images and histology?

I agree that it would be useful to also see analysis with CIN3+

minor comments

I agree that the ALTS data is now 20 years ago and from the US and these data are therefore less relevant today. I understood the images in ALTS to be cervicograms rather than colposcopy images. I agree that there has be evolution of image capture technologies and this supports interest in this paper.
Methods state that the treatment threshold was score of 5 and results score of 4 - please can you explain in discussion.

Line 151 says biopsies were taken from the TZ but line 125 from the SCJ. Which was it?

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**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.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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