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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript appears to have been extensively revised since the last submission in response to the reviews. An analysis was made that appear to indicate that gingivitis is more frequent in women with BV than in women that don’t have BV. Not surprisingly, many of the BV organisms such as P. bivia were found at higher levels in the BV+ samples—in this analysis apparently 84 (BV+) plus 49 (BV-) women were analyzed. It is also stated that higher levels of several bacteria were found in gingivitis versus no gingivitis, but now 184 samples were analyzed since these probably included the samples from women that were Nugent intermediate.

In the figure, comparisons between four groups were graphed. It is stated in that significant differences in a number of bacteria were found between BV+/G+ and BV-/G- groups, which is not surprising.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. Does this (results of figure 1) mean that there were no differences between BV+/G+ and BV+/G- or between BV-/G+ and BV-/G-? If so, this should be stated explicitly in the results. This would seem to argue against an association between gingivitis and genital bacteria.

2. Since the data is available, an analysis should be added to the figure and results showing values of intermediate/G+ compared with intermediate/G-.

3. In the last review, it was asked if duplicate samples were ever run and if they agreed. While the samples for this study may all be used up, it is important to determine how reproducible the assay is and this can be done with other samples. To obtain enough sample, two or more samples could be pooled and then run in the assay. The variation should then be reported.

4. In the abstract, it is stated that there were 83 BV- women and 58 BV+ women. On page 5 it states that there were 84 BV- and 49 BV-. Which is correct?

5. Minor Essential Revision; Figure 1 axis is not labeled.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests