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Response to Editor comments

1. Please respond to the Reviewer’s comment, below.
Done

2. Please change the article type to 'Technical Advance article' on our system.
Done
3. In your “Ethics approval and consent to participate” section of your Declarations, please confirm whether informed consent, written or verbal, was obtained from all patients whose samples were taken and used in this study, and clearly state it in this section. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure. If the need for consent was waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this, including the name of the IRB or a reference to the relevant legislation.

The section has been modified to specifically address the consent’s issue, as follows:

Ethics approval: The study has been approved by the IOV-IRCCS Ethical Committee (EC code 2017-07 plus EM 193/2017). The women who participate to the screening program give a written consent, and an additional specific consent for the study was deemed unnecessary, as all the samples were anonymized and the results of the study didn’t have any consequence for the women’s management.

4. Please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Done

Reviewer reports:

Collette Bromhead (Reviewer 1): The authors have answered my previous queries satisfactorily and included changes to their manuscript that I am satisfied improve it to the level required for publication. There is one paragraph in the methods section on page 7 in lines 123-130 that was very hard to understand because of the poor English, I have written a new version of this paragraph as a suggestion for the authors to consider:

"Both cobas HPV real-time PCR assays detect the same 14 types of HPV, use the same primers and probes, and provide partial genotyping for HPV16 and HPV18. The two assays do however differ in their Thermal Cycling (CT) profile, (the cobas6800/8800 runs a universal thermal cycling profile to allow for mixed batching of different PCR tests), as well as in the elution sample volume amplified (50μl on 6800/8800 vs 150μl on 4800 out of a 400μl aliquot of extracted nucleic acids).

Both HPV assays were performed according to the manufacturer's instructions. Each plate contained 92 clinical samples, 2 controls (selected from 10 internal and 5 external quality controls) and 2 clinical samples previously found to be invalid by the cobas 4800 HPV test."

I hope that is helpful.
We thank Dr. Bromhead for the suggestion; the paragraph in the methods section has been changed accordingly.