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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors,

Thank you very much for your kind offer to consider a revised version of our manuscript. We are very grateful for your comments, and we have revised the manuscript accordingly.

Below please find each of the comments followed by our response (indicated by an arrow).

Best regards,

Feng Zhou, M.D.
Responses to editor comments:

1) In the Abstract Methods section, it should be indicated that biological testing included HSV as well as HIV and syphilis.

◊ Done. (Page 2, lines 11)

2) Page 6, Line 24; RUSH needs to be capitalized as it is throughout the rest of the manuscript.

◊ Done. (Page 3, lines 24)

3) Page 7, lines 7-9: In describing the cohort study by Li et al., the authors of this manuscript have confused prevalence and INCIDENCE. New infections in a cohort are incident, not prevalent.

◊ I checked the original article and found that was a cross-sectional survey about RUSH. I have changed the sentence. (Page 4, lines 6-8)

4) Page 7, line 13: It is unclear what "...more likely to prefer sexual pleasure..." means. I suggest that the authors revise this sentence to be more precise and they might even want to use the exact language of the pertinent question.

◊ Done. (Page 4, lines 11-13)

5) Page 9, line 14 should read: "The questionnaire answers were double-entered and analyzed using Epidata software..."

◊ Epidata software is used for data management, such as data entry, double entry check. I have changed the sentence. (Page 6, lines 13)
6) Page 10 line 1 should read: "A total of 500 participants was..."

After consulting a dictionary, I confirm that the predicate of “a total of…” is “were” and “the total of ….” is “was”.

7) Page 10, lines 8-9: It is unclear what "diagnosed patients of syphilis" means. If the authors mean that these people had previously received a diagnosis of syphilis, they should rephrase it this way.

Done. (Page 7, lines 7)

8) Page 11, line 11: The English is "overseas", not oversea.

Done. (Page 8, lines 10)

9) Page 14, line 9: There is no legal rationale given for the suggestion that RUSH is either illegal or should be prohibited, so this sentence should be deleted. It goes beyond the data presented on harms. associated with RUSH use.

Done.

10) The yellow highlights throughout the paper, indicating text new to the revision, can be removed.

Done.