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Replies to the Editorial Team comments

We would like to thank the Editorial Team for the comments regarding our work. Our replies to their comments are:

Reviewer: Catterina Ferreccio
Minor essential revisions

Point 1. Abstract: list the HPV genotypes studied.

Answer: The studied HPV genotypes are now listed on the Methods section.

Point 2. Abstract and results section: Mention the Papanicolaou status of women when tested.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. This is now stated in the text (page 9, paragraph 1) as well as in the Abstract (Results).

Point 3. Page 8, third par and discussion section: regarding multiple infections please specify if you are considering absolute rate of multiple infections (14/225= 6.2%) or relative to the positives (14 out of 51 =27.4%), especially important when comparing with other studies.

Answer: The percentage is referring to the absolute rate of multiple infections. This is now stated in the text (page 10, paragraph 1). However, in the discussion section it is stated clearly that the rate is referring to the total study population (page 12, paragraph 3).

Point 4. Table 2: since the reference is higher income, should be interpreted as lower risk among the lower income group. IN the body of the abstract is OK but it is incorrect int its conclusion.. "risk factor of HPV infection ..and poor income"; should say higher income.

Answer: Thank you for your comment. The correction has been done in the Abstract (Conclusion) and in the manuscript (page 13, paragraph 2 and page 14, paragraph 2).
**Point 5.** It would be very interesting to have the numbers of positive for each HPV genotype tested.

**Answer:** The numbers of positive for each HPV genotype tested are now mentioned in the text (page 9, paragraph 3).

**Point 6.** Also present HPV prevalence by Pap results if available.

**Answer:** Unfortunately data regarding the present HPV prevalence by Pap results are not available.
Associate Editor:

**Point 1.** The definition of newly diagnosed cases should be given in the material and methods section, and the authors should explain if these newly diagnosed cases were ever screened for HPV infection in the past.

**Answer:** Thank you for your comment. As newly diagnosed cases for HPV infection were considered women with a negative history according to their medical history. Therefore, newly diagnosed cases included women that have never been screened for HPV infection. This is now stated in the text (page 5, paragraph 2).

**Point 2.** They have to remove odds-ratio from table 1 (Jennifer Smith required that 95%CI be given in the table, not the ORs) and table 1 should be presented with three columns: HPV positive, HPV negative, and a P value for the comparison of the two columns (justifying their references to the t test or Chisquare listed in the stat analysis para). The headers of the first two columns should include the total numbers in each subsample.

**Answer:** We add another two columns in table 2 with the characteristics of the HPV negative women as well as the P value for the comparison between the two subgroups.

**Point 3.** It is not clear if women with a previous history of HPV infection were found in the HPV negative subsample?

**Answer:** Thank you for your comment. It is noteworthy that 77.6% (38/49) of the women with a previous history for HPV infection were found in the HPV negative subsample. This is now stated in the text (page 10, paragraph 1).
**Point 4.** As regards table 2 and point 11 raised by Jeniffer Smith, it is not clear whether "lower vs higher" income referred to <1000 euros vs > 1000 euros" or to "per 1000 euros increase". The authors should clarify.

**Answer:** It is stated clearly in the Methods section that females whose monthly incomes did not exceed 1,000 Euros were considered as low income (page 5, paragraph 1). Therefore, "lower vs. higher" income refers to <1,000 euros vs. > 1,000 euros per month. This is now stated in table 2.