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Author's response to reviews: see over
The abstract reports HPV-type specific rates as prevalence rates among women with cancer. The authors need to specify that what they are reporting is actually the type-specific prevalence among HPV-positive women. If they wish to report the type-specific prevalence rates among women with cancer, then the denominator of each rate should be all the women with cancer who were tested, not only the women who were HPV positive.

The prevalence for HPV types is for only amongst the HPV-positive samples. We have now clarified the report of HPV type-distribution among HPV positive samples vs. overall/type-specific HPV prevalence in the manuscript as requested by the reviewers (page 2, line 18, page 9, line 4).

Authors did not include the p-value for the association of HPV prevalence with age in the community.

The requested p-value corresponding to the lack of an age association with HPV prevalence has been added to both the text and the table (page 9, line 23 and page 20: Table 2, line 35).

Reviewer: Elizabeth R Unger

Declaration of competing interests: I have received reagents from Roche Molecular Diagnostics.

The same has now been included

Editorial letter had stated language corrections are needed in order for the manuscript to be suitable for publication.

Our US colleagues have reviewed the manuscript and revised the writing to reflect more standard English grammar.