Reviewer's report

Title: Kaposi’s sarcoma associated herpesvirus infection among female sex workers and general women in Shanghai, China: a cross-sectional study

Version: 3  Date: 11 December 2013

Reviewer: Jesse Clark

Reviewer's report:

The revised manuscript has addressed almost all previous comments and has been substantially improved. I have only a few minor comments:

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions
1) Methods p. 6, "The minimum number of study subjects to achieve a power of 0.95 at a significance level of 0.05 (two-tailed) was calculated as 430 for each group." Please specify, power to detect what?

2) Methods pp. 6-7, The authors state that participants were recruited by visiting sex work venues or households, but how were participants recruited from these sites? Face to face (if so, who did the invitation)? Posted advertisements? Peer invitation?

3) Methods, pp. 8-9, The authors describe in the manuscript that they have followed the manufacturer’s instructions for the Focus HerpeSelect EIA and state in their response (though not in the manuscript) that the manufacturer recommended cut-off value for seropositivity used was 1.1. However, multiple previous studies using this assay have suggested that, especially in high prevalence populations, the 1.1 cut-off value results in a high amount of false-positive results and so a higher cut-off value of 3.5 is frequently used now. Obviously it is perfectly acceptable to use the manufacturer’s recommended cut-off value of 1.1, but given the fact that HSV-2 seroprevalence is one of the factors used to determine whether KSHV can be considered a heterosexual STI in this population, it would be important to at least comment on the potential limitation of using the lower cut-off value and the possibility of bias in the estimation of HSV-2 prevalence.

Discretionary Revisions
1) Abstract (and throughout), the term "general women" is unclear, and it may be better to describe this group as "women from the general population" or "general population women"

2) Page 16, Lines 1-2, "heterosexual contacts is unlikely" should be "are unlikely"
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