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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

The authors would like to thank the editors for their meticulous review and we apologize for the errors in numbers. Please see below the responses to the comments:

1. In the abstract the upper limit of 95% CI for OR of “injection with reused sryinge” is wrong, comparing it with table 2.

   Thank you for the observation. The lower limit of the 95% CI was revised and corrected in the abstract according to table 2.

2. It should be useful if the questionnaire were included in the manuscript so to have the list of all factors considered in the univariate analysis.

   Questionnaire was sent to the editor as supplementary material for an exhaustive description of covariates.

3. In row 10 of table 1 the percentage symbol before “Male” is not necessary.

   The percentage symbol was removed as per the suggestion of the reviewer.

4. Comparing the paragraph “Univariate analysis” and table 2-3, there are some
disagreement in relation to following variables:
- “receiving dental care in an outpatient setting”, in table 2 the variable is significantly associated, in the text it should be correct.

The text was revised according to the results in table 2.

- “visiting a family planning clinic”, in table 2 the variable has a significant p value but the corresponding 95% CI for OR is incorrect because it includes the value 1. Then it should be corrected in the text.

The text was corrected to indicate that although the p value was significant, the 95% interval includes 1

- “labor”, in table 3 the variable has a significant p value but the corresponding 95% CI for OR is incorrect because it includes the value 1. Could it be a wrong rounding of the lower limit of 95% CI? It should be corrected also in the text.

The 95% CI was revised and corrected in table 3 and the text was revised accordingly.

5. In the 2nd paragraph of “Multivariate analysis for risk factors” the number of risk factors should be 6.

Change done!

Editorial Board Comments:

The authors should carefully check all numbers in the body of the paper and the tables.

All numbers were revised carefully and the authors apologize for the errors.