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Reviewer’s report:

The MS is interesting and contains new information, material and methods at the end of the paper is in the biochemical tradition and different from clinical MS´s, nevertheless the referee is accepting this form.

Minor Essential Revisions:
Throughout the MS subjects are called patients - they are NOT patients for this study, and some are just school teenagers.
The reason for saliva collection should be mentioned, the storage on ice (?) means what?
Pediatric samples is the wrong term ant not at all age-related (ages 2 - 11).
The presence of HPV in saliva is not (yet) an infection, this is rather part of the oral microbiota.
Please avoid phrases like "most were White" for two out of three, or "all three were males and none were female".
Budgetary constrains within the University system may influence the research activity, but this argument should not serve as an excuse for the number of subjects etc.
The references should appear in the BMC style: Abbreviations of all Journals.
Materials should be declared by (Company, City, Country, State). Do not use country abbreviations for the US, the rest of the world does not understand, Goettingen is the correct city (but not the company Head Quarter of Zeiss).
Fig. 2 C is completely unclear: Min.?; 63% ?; and so many = ?

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

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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