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Reviewer's report:

I agree the author said: "Even with the limitations in study design we believe it is valuable to present our results to the scientific community. We think it is interesting that we found a less diverse microbiota and a tendency towards an increase of Lactobacillus after LEEP confirming the findings by Zhang et al - to the best of our knowledge the only study published comparing microbiota before and after LEEP so far.” The two studies have different racial groups and different tracking times. And these two studies have similar conclusions that are meaningful findings. However, there are still some statements that need to be revised in the title of the article and the narrative of the discussion.

1. In the title of the article: The results of the study are limited to the Norwegian region only.

2. In the discussion: The limitations on this study must still be clearly stated, such as the menopausal status, participants a few days before the sampling time whether there is sexual activity and menstration, and antibiotics/probiotics for other diseases. The purpose is to make future correlation studies aware of the interference factors that influence the results of the study.

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

Yes

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:
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