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Dear editors and reviewers,

Thanks very much for the suggested revisions. With my coauthors, I have followed reviewer suggestions and the attached revised manuscript is much stronger as a result. I have made the following specific changes:

1) Each word or phrase that reviewers suggested that could be confusing or misinterpreted has been revised to add clarity and accuracy to the report.
2) As per reviewer George Nyandoro, the sampling method used to describe the selection of participants has been changed to reflect that this was a convenience sample, stated in the Methods section of the manuscript. The limitation of the study, which has been added to the Discussion section, has been revised to indicate that, as a result of this sampling procedure, the findings cannot be reliably generalized beyond this area of Southwest Cameroon.
3) Per suggestion of Henry Bautista-Amoroch
   (a) The discussion section has been deepened.
   (b) The lower OR among “never married” in HIV compared to the higher OR among never married for HBV is referenced in the Introduction section which now describes past studies on high-risk sexual variables associated with HIV but not HBV.
   (c) The limitation section has been added and addresses issues of generalization.
   (d) An explanation for the 2 rapid test for HIV infection is not included, as a verification test on samples testing positive is standard practice.
   (e) Percentages consistently add up to 100% in the Results section.
4) Per reviewer Trevor Crowell,
   (a) The prevalence percentages for HIV and HBV in the abstract and introduction have been clarified to be accurate and consistent.
   (b) Variables considered for inclusion in the model included both (1) variables significantly associated in the univariate analysis as well as (2) additional variables apparent from the literature or prior knowledge. Since the literature or prior
knowledge failed to indicate the importance of any variable in addition to those associated in the univariate analysis, these were the variables included.

(c) A sensitivity analysis was not considered appropriate in this case because the p-value used is based on standard practice. A higher p-value would increase the likelihood of spurious results while a lower p-value would reduce the power of the test.

(d) Discussion of hypotheses mentioned in lines 243-248 has been revised to be consistent and are now stated in the introduction.

Thanks again to the reviewers for their valuable suggestions.

Sincerely,

Lauren Shevell