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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Shaaban,

We are very grateful for your editorial comments and the reviewers’ comments regarding our manuscript. We would like to thank in particular Dr. Zeng for her excellent contributions that have helped us to improve the quality of the manuscript.

Please find enclosed the revised paper with major changes to our original article entitled “It might be cancer. All those things they don’t tell you”: Health care challenges for women diagnosed with Cervical Intraepithelial Neoplasia”.

Regarding originality, we would like to mention that while our study corroborates results obtained by other international researchers, it also makes an original contribution showing patients’ informational needs across their entire health care experience, from when they were diagnosed with CIN in primary care to their follow-up and medical treatment in specialized care.
A detailed account of the changes made are as follows (please see the text highlighted in the manuscript):

1. Title:
   - Editor comment: “Consider changing the title as requested by the reviewer.”
   - Reviewer 2 comment: “The title of this study can be revised as "Health care challenges for women diagnosed with Cervical Intraepithelial Neoplasia: A qualitative study." which can be directly show the study design.
   - Authors comment: We have adopted the title suggestion, including the word "informational" to make it more specific: "Health care informational challenges for women diagnosed with Cervical Intraepithelial Neoplasia: A qualitative study" (page 1).

2. Introduction/Background section:
   - Editor comment: “Introduction section should convince the reader about what is new in this work” and “The aim of the work should be more focused”.
   - Reviewer 2 comment: “In introduction section, please authors elaborate more information about the rational of conducting this study?”
   - Authors comment: We have revised the introduction section, describing the study objective as it relates to the paper, showing the rationale of developing the research and how the study’s original contribution (page 3)

3. Discussion section:
   - Reviewer 2 comment: “In discussion section, please authors added what's new of this study uniquely found? As two themes identified from this study were also reported by internationally, previous published research in terms of women with CIN lack knowledge about their condition, which limits their self-care results in negative psychological effects, and lack enough information between health care providers and patients.”
   - Authors comment: We have revised the language to clearly show the novel contribution of our study at Spanish and international levels (pages: 12-13)
4. Other changes:

- We have revised the abstract to reflect the new content and added sentences to results and conclusions sections to incorporate your recommendations (pages: 2, 5-11, 14).

Thank you again for your recommendations and for considering our re-submission.

Sincerely,

Carla Freijomil-Vázquez
BSc(N), MSc, PhD(C)
Universidade da Coruña
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