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Dear John Kerr,

We thank the external Associate Editors for their careful review and comments. We have revised the discussion and table one to address these comments. A revised document with changes is included, and below we respond point by point to the concerns.

(i) the sum of unprotected sex intercourses does not correspond to the number of people who did not use condom (see Table 1). In fact, 9 untested clients did not use condom but 11 unprotected intercourses were reported. Along the same line, 7 tested clients did not use condom but 9 unprotected intercourses were reported (5 oral/genital + 4 unknown). Please correct or explain in a table footnote (perhaps Authors should check all numbers again to avoid any mistake appearing in the published manuscript);

Response: It is true that the sum of unprotected sex does not correspond to the number of clients who acknowledge no persistent use of condom with sex workers. This is caused by the fact that a client may have more than one type of unprotected sexual intercourse with the sex workers. Therefore we have added a footnote to explain this issue. In addition we decided to delete the percentages next to the types of unprotected sex as they were also a source of confusion to the reader in the interpretation of the numbers. We have checked again all the numbers to avoid any mistake.

(ii) a footnote to Table 1 should clarify what is the meaning of the Sw achronim. Moreover, the meaning of "oral", "genital" (vaginal?) and "anal" should be clarified in a table footnote (for example by saying that they are "types of unprotected sexual intercourse");

Response: We have clarified the meaning of sw by adding a footnote to table 1. The meaning of oral, anal and genital has also been clarified in the table by adding "type(s) of unprotected sexual intercourse(s)" in the table.
Response:
We agree with this point and added 3 sentences in the discussion to better describe our setting and reassure the readers about transferability of the results.
In the second paragraph we added the following sentences:

“By placing the bus on a dead end street, the survey and HIV testing took advantage of the well restricted area where cars engaging in the street know that it leads “only” to sex workers. We were able to cover 100 % of the cars engaging on this street and approximately 70 % of the clients visiting the district (as the vast majority engage on all 4 streets when looking for a street sex worker). The setting of the bus parked in the red light district with professional nurses face to face with the client inside the bus to perform HIV rapid testing was satisfactory from the technical, medical and patient point of view.”

In summary, we have responded to the comments and have made (with the first revised manuscript) significant revisions which we are hopeful will address the comments. We hope to hear from you in the near future.

On behalf of all the co-authors,

M. Cavassini, MD
Infectious Diseases Service
CHUV
1011 Lausanne
Switzerland