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Author's response to reviews: see over
Hans Zauner, Ph.D. Assistant Editor
BMC-series Journals
BioMed Central
Middlesex House
34-42 Cleveland Street
London W1T 4LB

Dear Dr. Zauner,

Attached please find a revised version of our systematic review article previously submitted to *BMC Infectious Diseases* entitled “**Epidemiologic Natural History and Clinical Management of Human Papillomavirus (HPV) Disease: A Critical and Systematic Review of the Literature in the Development of An HPV 6/11/16/18 Dynamic Transmission Model**” (MS: 1612161737200649).

We thank the Editorial Board and reviewers for their further consideration of the manuscript and additional suggestions for improvement, which we have attempted to incorporate as described below.

Thank you again for your consideration of this manuscript.

Sincerely,

Ralph P. Insinga, Ph.D.

---

**Responses to Editorial Board Comments**

**Editorial Board**

Merck & Co. Inc. UG1C-60, P.O. Box 1000, North Wales, PA 19454-1099
Phone: (267) 305-7992; Fax: (267) 305-6455; E-mail: ralph_insinga@merck.com
1. Our Editorial Board feels that it should be clearly acknowledged in the discussion of the manuscript that the authors' own previous work contributed significantly to the literature covered by this systematic review.

Response: We have added a sentence noting the role of our own work among studies contributing to this review at the end of the second paragraph on page 39.

2. Our Editorial Board also recommends to include a succinct description of the inclusion/exclusion criteria and the search strategy, including MeSh terms and Boolean terms, in the Methods section of the main manuscript. We also recommend to include a flow chart, showing how many articles have been retrieved and how many have been 'ruled in' or 'ruled out' based on the chosen criteria. As far as we understand, only PubMed (and not other sources such as EMBASE) has been used and our Editorial Board recommends that this should at least be discussed as a limitation.

Response: We have provided additional information in the Methods section (page 7 first paragraph) describing the ten different parameter groups for which individualized searches of the PubMed database were conducted. Because terms used within each of these searches were diverse, and there were ten separate searches, it is difficult to succinctly provide the level of detail requested regarding MeSh and Boolean terms within the main body of the document without lengthening the manuscript considerably and duplicating most of the information currently provided in the Appendix. If it is desired to incorporate this information into the main body of the paper, we would suggest relabeling the current Appendix as "Table 1" and placing it within the body of the manuscript, as the search information would seem to be better visualized and organized in tabular form than as dense paragraphs of text.

Information on the total number of articles retrieved from each search, and selected for incorporation into this literature review, has been added to the Appendix. It is correct that the EMBASE database was not searched for this review and we have added note of this to the Discussion on pages 39-40.