You have conducted an extensive piece of work in reviewing an important area. Unfortunately I have several problems with the manuscript as it currently stands:

1. The Methods are not as transparent as they should be and they assume a high degree of insider knowledge ie where did the educate/restructure/quality categories come from and similarly where did the 7 implementation outcomes derive from? If using external frameworks their derivation and definition should be clearly stated.

2. The search strategy is found wanting firstly in the mismatch between how it is described in the narrative and how it appears in the Appendix, and secondly in the absence of country specific search terms which could have missed at least 25% of the eligible literature.

3. The relevance of included studies specifically to implementation is not clear (perhaps articulating your framework upfront would have made this clearer); and then in contrast you enter into a discussion on problems with implementation research generally but with little reference back to your own dataset.

4. The exclusion of qualitative research in the context of implementation is surprising and requires a very strong justification.

Specifically my comments are:

Abstract

"Following PRISMA guidelines" - PRISMA guidelines are not a standard for conducting a review; they are a reporting standard. This is like using a taste test to specify a recipe! The article should be written up according to PRISMA guidelines but that is quite different from conducting a review according to them. (Also Applies to Methods Section)

The Methods in the Abstract should specify the Study Type that you sought - you only include quantitative studies is that because qualitative were deliberately excluded or simply not found? I suspect the former but you should tell us in the Abstract.
"with an overall publication date range from 1996 to 2016" Delete - earlier this was your date restriction so it is not a finding to report this as the range of the studies you actually found!

Background:

"Furthermore, young women bear a disproportionate burden compared to their male peers" You should make it more clear that you are still referring to HIV, not cervical cancer which is the focus of the paper.

I have three problems with the following strategy:

(sub-Saharan Africa) AND (cervical cancer) AND (prevention OR program implementation OR HPV vaccine OR Pap smear OR see-and-treat OR VIA OR VILI OR colposcopy OR LEEP OR cryotherapy).

(1) Conceptually unrelated terms are grouped together ie the implementation terms and the cervical screening terms in the short version - this does not reflect the syntax in the strategies in the Appendix.

(2) Insufficient numbers of synonyms are used for each concept (e.g. you don't have other terms for implementation eg. Programme implementation (English spelling) or a "screening" term

(3) You do not specify the names of the SSA countries individually which would be essential for a search of this type (e.g. trying Kenya and Ghana I had variously 30 and 10 papers missed by your strategy which projected across all SSA countries could be in the region of 600 references missed)

The Appendix version is better and more complete but should be accurately conveyed in the text.

If you are indeed following PRISMA guidelines for reporting then you should be reporting who was involved in each stage of the review - how many sifters, how many extractors, were any cross checking processes used to verify results. You only mention this in connection with the full text.

"publication dates range from 1996 to 2016". As mentioned above this was an inclusion criterion not a finding!

Given the topic of implementation the exclusion of qualitative studies i.e. reporting implementation barriers is very surprising and needs to be justified. Using quantitative only studies for acceptability and feasibility seems unnecessarily constrained.
"Researchers used educate (n=29, 72.5%), restructure (n=20, 50%), and quality 222 (n=11, 27.5%) strategies most frequently in their studies." You should state where these categories come from and how they were defined.

"Through conducting this literature search, the authors have found no review to date that addresses the implementation of cervical cancer prevention programs in SSA."

What about?:


"2 of the 7 outcomes (adoption and appropriateness) were not measured in the review and should be considered for inclusion in future studies." Needs explanation of where these 7 outcomes come from. Also recognition required that appropriateness may be covered by qualitative studies which do not seem to have been included.

"To ensure accuracy, a sample of initial articles was screened and quality assessed by a second reviewer. Inconsistencies were resolved through consensus before the primary reviewer proceeded with the remaining articles." This detail should be mentioned in the Methods first, before the Limitations. Also the actual Limitation is that you only did this for a sample, not the entire cohort of studies.
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