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Dear Ms Rada:

I have received the reviewers’ comments to my resubmission of the debate “Highly-cited estimates of the cumulative incidence and recurrence of vulvovaginal candidiasis are inadequately documented.” My responses to the reviewers follow.

With best regards,

Sujit D Rathod, MSc PhD
Editorial Requirements: Please ensure you refer to the article as a "Debate" and not as a "review" throughout the manuscript.

Author’s response: I have revised the article accordingly.

Further, I have re-formatted the article using the template available on the biomedcentral.com website.
Reviewer #1: Betsy Foxman

Reviewer's report: I stand by my original review

Author’s response: I respectfully stand by my original response to this reviewer.

In Dr Foxman’s original review, she stated “However, the totality of all the studies they reviewed suggest that VVC occurs and recurs frequently.” I believe this point is the crux of the debate. Our points - and Dr Foxman’s counter-points - speak to the suitability of our manuscript as a Debate in *BMC Women’s Health*.
Reviewer #3: Ana Paula Sampaio Carvalho

Reviewer's report: The alterations made by the author are in accordance with my requests and, since the majority of the requests by the other reviewers were addressed, in my opinion the manuscript is OK.

Author’s response: I thank the reviewer for her comments.
Reviewer #4: Cathy Watson

Reviewer’s report: I'm happy with the amended manuscript,

Author’s response: I thank the reviewer for her comments.