

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/gpm-23-42>

Reviewer A

This very well-written commentary on "Exploring Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Cervical Cancer's Histologic Subtypes" is an essential contribution to the ongoing discourse on cervical cancer disparities in the United States. Utilizing SEER data, the authors provide a nuanced examination of how racial and ethnic factors influence the prevalence and characteristics of cervical cancer. The article could benefit from some mention of the potential role of differential vaccination access, uptake and completion by race and its implications on the differential cervical cancer rates observed (cohort effect? waning immunity?). This would further elevate some critical questions about the historical and systemic factors contributing to these disparities and invites further exploration into how public health initiatives can be better tailored to address these challenges.

Moreover, the commentary could benefit from engaging with the implications of the WHO's global strategy to eliminate cervical cancer disparities. This global perspective would not only broaden the scope of the discussion but also provide a valuable context for understanding how international efforts can influence and support local and national strategies. The inclusion of these two aspects would significantly enhance the commentary's relevance in the broader context of global health and equitable access to cancer care and prevention.

Reply: We have added a detailed discussion about differential vaccination access and WHO's global strategy to eliminate cervical cancer disparities (see Page 3, line 67 – 73 and Page 4, line 74 – 89).

Reviewer B

The authors present relevant perspectives on an important research article.

Please find my recommendations below:

Comment 1: Authors need to provide a clear and concise take-home message from the article.

Reply 1: The conclusion was extensively modified in order to better establish and enrich a take home message from the commented study (see Page 4, line 90 – 98).

Comment 2: Lines 18-21: The sentence is lengthy and challenging to read. Break it up into at least two sentences.

Reply 2: This excerpt has been appropriately reformulated (see Page 2, line 36 – 40).

Comment 3: Lines 29-36: Authors should provide their perspective on the article instead of copying/repeating results from the article.

Reply 3: This excerpt was appropriately reformulated in order to provide a critical view of the content of the commented study (see Page 2, line 41 – 48).

Comment 4: Provide your perspectives logically to make it easy for readers to follow your points, e.g., use – first, second, etc., before each point.

Reply 4: This excerpt has been appropriately reformulated (see Page 3, line 63 – 66).