May 7th, 2021

Dear editors,

Thanks again for the reviewer's opinions for our manuscript. We are very grateful for the reviewer's time and effort. Thank you for your consideration. The following are the detailed point-to-point answers for all of the questions.

Best Regards,

Keqin Hua

Review 1:

Conclusion: Minor revision

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Minor concerns.

1. This has already been mentioned by author in line no.58-63. (line 96-101).

Answer: We delete this part in the text (line96-101).

2. Does that mean that already 16 patients have been evaluated by this dual technique, if yes rather than publishing it as case report should that not be considered as pilot study? (line 107).

Answer: 16 patients have been evaluated by both colposcopy and

vaginalscopy. 2 (12.5%) had serious histology via vaginoscopy compared with histology via colposcopy. 1 of them was diagnosed carcinoma, which was typical, and of great clinical guidance. So we chose this case to make the report. We are currently collecting more data and planning to submit an article.

3. Histology should be specified. Spelling error. (line 109).

Answer: Due to space limitations, we can provide it as supplementary material.

case	colposcopy	vaginalscopy
1	HSIL	inflamation
2	LSIL	inflamation
3	LSIL	Normal
4	HSIL	Abscess
5	LSIL	Normal
6S	inflamation	HSIL
7S	HSIL	CA
8	inflamation	inflamation
9	inflamation	inflamation
10	inflamation	inflamation
11	inflamation	Normal
12	LSIL	LSIL

13	LSIL	LSIL
14	LSIL	LSIL
15	LSIL	LSIL
16	normal	normal