



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	2013_ISRR_7983
Title of the Manuscript:	ONCOGENIC HUMAN PAPILLOMAVIRUS DETECTION IN PENILE LICHEN SCLEROSUS: AN UPDATE
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	N/A	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The authors indicate that the aim of the study was to better define the prevalence of HPV infections in patients with penile lichen sclerosus. Rather the study addresses the association of HPV infection with LS not just the prevalence. In the results section it may be more informative if the percentages of each HPV types that were identified among the cases(LS) and the controls (healthy men). In the discussion (line 148) were these 46 patients all diagnosed with LS? There are results described for controls but it is not clear how many LS and how many controls were included in the study...also it is unclear what was the HPV detection rate in the healthy subjects.. the authors only say "A HPV detection rate of 17.4% was found in 8 patients and in 4 healthy subjects..."	This is a relevant and valuable observation. According to this, the corresponding sentences in the abstract and text have been changed as suggested. HPV detection rates have been added in the results section as requested. We confirm that all 46 patients were diagnosed with LS as stated in the text. Also, we agree that the above cited sentence sounds unclear. Therefore, it has been changed as follows: "Our group had previously demonstrated a high HPV detection rate in patients with genital LS. Oncogenic HPV infection was found in 8 (17.4%) out of 46 patients with genital LS, compared to 4 (8.7%) out of an equal number of randomly selected control healthy subjects matched for age."
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Very interesting results	