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To the editor

Our manuscript “Impact of migration origin on individual protection strategies against sexual transmission of HIV in Paris metropolitan area, SIRS cohort study, France” (BMC ref. 1313306418111822) has been modified according to the reviewers’ suggestions. Actually, one reviewer accepted the manuscript as it was presented, and the other one just requested 3 small corrections in grammar.

Best regards,

Thomas Kesteman

1. Reviewer: Jason Roy

Has no comment.

2. Reviewer: Janni J. Kinsler

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Revision/Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abstract (conclusions – line 2): ....“populations in consideration when designing information.... “ should be “populations into consideration when designing information....”</strong></td>
<td>Manuscript modified according to referee’s suggestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Background (line 9): An important part of people having migrated to France have settled in Paris and its suburbs. The above sentence is very awkward.</strong></td>
<td>Manuscript modified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods (migration origin – line 2): “We defined participants’ &quot;migration origin&quot; on the basis of their nationality and their parents' ones.” Perhaps say the following instead: We defined participants’ “migration origin” on the basis of both their nationality and their parents’ nationality</strong></td>
<td>Manuscript modified according to referee’s suggestion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>