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Reviewer's report:

It is an interesting retrospective study that focus on the follow-up of women with cervical pre invasive lesions treated with LEEP. However, there are some points to be clarified.

Methods

1) I believe that the study was approved by the University ethics committee, but this information is missing.

2) More technical details about LEEP, laser ablation and endocervical curettage (EEC) procedures are needed. For EEC were women submitted to local anesthesia, in follow up visits? Please clarify criteria for using laser in combination with the LEEP: "frequently utilizes laser ablation in combination with LEEP, for large lesions"

3) After one year women were discharged to be followed up where? And how? Any specific recommendation?

Discussion

1) When did HPV vaccination start in Calgary?

2) I suggest to rephrase this: "A final limiting factor for this study is the lack of information on HPV vaccination status or HPV genotyping, which is not currently part of the standard of care in Canada".
3) "The majority of published literature on rates of treatment success and recurrence rates of CIN 2-3 indicate variable numbers to what has been documented in the Calgary Zone ". What about the heterogeneity of total time of follow up?

**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.

No

**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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