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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We want to express our gratitude once again for the efforts of the reviewers in improving our article: “Development of the Patient’s Experience and Attitude Colposcopy Eindhoven Questionnaire (PEACE-q)”. We have revised our manuscript according to the most recent suggestions from the reviewers. The point by point response is listed below. In addition, we highlighted the adjustments in the manuscript.

Technical comments:

1. Title Page - Please provide all author’s email address.

   Answer: We have provided all author’s email addresses.

2. Declaration - Please move Declaration Section after Abbreviation Section

   Answer: We have moved the declaration section and added the abbreviation section.
3. **Background** - Please rename Introduction to Background.

   Answer: We have renamed the introduction section.

4. **Conclusion** - Please include a Conclusions section (with subtitle) as the last section of the text. This should state clearly the main conclusions of the research and give a clear explanation of their importance and relevance. Summary illustrations may be included.

   Answer: We have included a conclusions section.

5. **Abbreviation** - Please include a list of abbreviations used in the manuscript and their meanings. This should be placed in between the Conclusions and Declarations sections and should have its own sub-heading.

   Answer: We have provided an abbreviations section.

Editor comments:

1. Reviewer suggested introduction and discussion need more overview of the context, previous studies and wider perspective on results in these sections.

   Reviewer 1: The authors addressed most of the comments however the introduction and discussion are still lacking wider perspective on the topic.

   Answer: We agree with the reviewer and have altered the introduction and discussion sections.