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Title: Risk of cancer among HIV-infected patients from a population-based retrospective cohort study: implications for cancer prevention

Version: 6 Date: 03 January 2015

Editor's comment:

"Many thanks for addressing the reviewers comments, prior to considering this paper for publications, please could you address the points below:

1. Is the study design a nested case-control study rather than retrospective cohort study?

Response: Yes, the study design is exactly a nested case-control study, but it is also a cohort study. According your suggestion, we revised the study design to “nested case-control study” in “Title”, “Abstract” and “Method” section.

2. The following sentence does not make sense,

“The duration of infection (time from HIV diagnosis to cancer occurrence) of the HIV-infection group was 41.94 (1 SD=±35.53) months. Because the patients maybe censor before cancer occurrence, the duration of infection was underestimated.”

It would be more helpful to the readers if you could include the number of subjects who were diagnosed with HIV at the same time as the cancer, then for the remainder of subjects report the median and range from HIV diagnosis to cancer diagnosis. You can then add a sentence regarding the fact that subjects may have had the HIV infection for a while prior to diagnosis, hence this time would be an underestimate.

Did these measurements differ by cancer site?

Response:

(1) According to your suggestion, we revised the sentence “The number of subjects who were diagnosed with HIV at the same time as the cancer was 48. The mean and range of duration of infection (from HIV diagnosis to cancer diagnosis) for the remainders was 41.94 (SD=±35.53) months. In fact, the subjects may have had the HIV infection for a while prior to diagnosis, hence this time would be an underestimate.” in the “Result” section, page 6, lines 25-26 and page 7, lines 1-3.

(2) According to your suggestion, we revised the sentence “The duration of infection was different by cancer site, the longest duration was cancers of bone and connective tissue (42.44±39.51 months), the shortest duration was lymphoma (17.91 ±18.17 months)” in the “Result” section, page 7, lines 24-25 and page 8, line 1.

3. Although change to although.
Response: We had revised although to “although” in the “Discussion” section, page 11, line 25.

4. Table 1 - round the percentages to one decimal place and remove the % from each value. It is in the column heading, so will be clear to the readers that these are percentages.

Response: We had rounded the percentages to one decimal place and removed the % from each value in Table 1. The revisions are shown in bold underlining for your convenience.