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Dear Dr Crow:

I am submitting for your consideration the revised manuscript entitled “Highly-cited estimates of the cumulative incidence and recurrence of vulvovaginal candidiasis are inadequately documented.” You requested two specific revisions to the manuscript, and our responses to these two are below.

1) “As you are aware, the Debate article type is intended for articles that present an argument, and I am concerned that the point you are arguing is not made explicit in your manuscript.”

We have re-ordered the sections of this paper and added language to make our arguments clear at the start of the paper. Additionally, we have changed the title of the paper to reflect our conclusion in this debate.

2) “In addition, in your abstract you refer to this submission as a review, which is not strictly true in this case.”

You are correct, this paper does not describe a systematic review of the literature. To avoid confusion by the reader, we have eliminated mention of the word “review” and use the term “search” to reflect our methods. The papers we cite were found opportunistically; we used the references from those actual papers to trace the epidemiologic estimates to their sources.

We sincerely appreciate your interest in our paper, and believe the revisions have greatly strengthened the clarity and purpose of this paper.

Please contact me if you would like any additional information or have questions you would like me to address.

With best regards,

Sujit D Rathod, MSc PhD