This A cross-sectional population-based study of hreat cancer screening among women with HVI mortal, Canada Mathan Libra (Canada Mathan N. Burchell PhD, Mann Burchell PhD, Mann Libra PhD, Than PhD, Mann Andrew PhD, Tony Antoniou PhD Reviewer Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division face Division fac	Article defails	;; 2017-0038
Claire E. Kendell MD PhD, Sharon Walmaley MD, Cindy Lau MH, Nathaniel Jembere MPH, Am N. Burchle PhD, Mong Anthona PhD Reviewer 7 Dr. Wilson Pace Method Sharon Roseners ANL LOC M, Sean B. Rouck PhD, Tany Antoniau PhD Review 7 Dr. Wilson Pace Low Monther Robot PhD, Phon Roseners ANL LOC M, Sean B. Roucke PhD, Tany Antoniau PhD Mong Anthone PhD Tany Antoniau PhD	Title	A cross-sectional population-based study of breast cancer screening among women with HIV in Ontario, Canada
Authors Loudy AD MPH, Jonel Robould PhD, Rom Rosens XM LLD CM, Seon B. Rourke PhD, Tony Antoniou PhD Reviewer J Or Wilson Roce Reviewer J Or Wilson Roce Comments Evergins Comments Evergins Comments Evergins Double of the the observational study of mormography rates over a 2 year period of time in women with and without HIV ling in province, comparing HIV positive women to the HIV negative population. The question has increasing relevance as individuals with HV continus to lise longer lives and needs the orge for a great routher of type. The data sources and prior linking across the various data bases, which is dare by ICE, are a great asset to the study and investigations. Given understal converge for mammography in the ogg group solidal (50-74) and universal mormography reminders with by the institute of Clinkington. Given understal converge for mammography in the ogg group solidal (50-74) and universal mormography reminders with by the student of the study of the monuscriptive women. The methods are reasonably described. The impact of data linkages at the individual level is mentioned in the STROBE statement section but on it the bady of the monuscriptive data more and prior works without the individual level is mentioned in the STROBE statement section and the study understal dormal conversity validated during the measure of indegram describing this data less acress the analytical formework should be induked, at least for the HIV positive works through the presented information allows the reader to dearly understand the readers. The methods are reasonabled dormal in the tables are well laid out. The dis		Claire E. Kendall MD PhD, Sharon Walmsley MD, Cindy Lau MPH, Nathaniel Jembere MPH, Ann N. Burchell PhD, Mona
Reviewort 1 Dr. Wilson Pace Institution 1 University of Colorado, Ennity Medicine, Boulder, Colo. General 2 Strengths Comments 1 This is an observational study of mammagraphy rates over a 2 year period of time in women with and without HIV living in programs on study of the	Authors	Loutfy MD MPH, Janet Raboud PhD, Ron Rosenes MA LLD CM, Sean B. Rourke PhD, Tony Antoniou PhD
Institution University of Calarado, Family Medicine, Boulder. Colo. General Comment Control Co	Reviewer 1	Dr. Wilson Pace
General comments (author) This is an observational study is to describe breast cancer screening activities at the population level in the propone in bold) This is an observational study is to describe breast cancer screening activities at the population level in the propone in bold with HV continue to live longer lives and neach the gap for a grader number of preventine services, including provided with HV continue to live longer lives and neach the gap for a grader number of preventine services, including provide with HV continue to live longer lives and neach the gap for a grader number of preventine services, including provide services and provides the study and investigators. Given universal coverage for mammegraphy in the age group studied (50-74) and universal memography reminders sent by the provided graderment to vorem in the age chore the study environment provides an excellent back drap to examine the screening decisions of HV positive women. The methods are reasonably decision for HV positive women. The analytical variables were either clearly delineated in the databases of interest (receipt of mammegraphy previned) validated (identification of HV) positive study. The outcome due to provide both as asolute differences and relative risk with and without controlling for differences in the underlying populations. Though the sheer volume of information takes time to work through the presented information allows the reader to clearly understand the results. The overall results as represented in the tables on well livid out. The discussion mashy eniterests the findings. The importance of enagement with a regular primary care site/bylicidan is bighlighted across both populations based on enrollment versus non-enrollment and total number of visits. The limitations are reasonable discussed. We thank the reviewer for the careful review and thoughtful comments regarding our paper. Concerns 1. As mentioned above a flow diagram of data losses across linked datasets should be provided at less for the HV posilive w	Institution	University of Colorado, Family Medicine, Boulder. Colo.
<pre>comments (outfor response in Genteric Caneda. The aim of the study is to describe breast concer screening activities at the population level in the province, comparing HVP positive women to the HVP regrive population. The question has increasing relevance and province, comparing HVP positive women to the HVP regrive population. The question has increasing relevance and province, comparing HVP positive women to the HVP regrive population. The question has increasing relevance and province, comparing HVP positive women to the HVP regrive population. The question has increasing relevance and province in a gency funded to create linked databases maintained by the lentiture of Clinical Schulards and province in a gency funded to create linked databases maintained by the lentiture of Clinical Schulards. Given the province in the population of the study and investigators. Given the screening described. The impact of data linkages at the individual level is mentioned in the STROBE statement section but not in the body of the manuscript. While data loss oppears to be minimal of Bow diagram describing works the cells of definitions are obscribed. The impact of data linkages at the individual level is mentioned in the STROBE statement section but not in the body of the manuscript. While data loss oppears to be minimal of Bow diagram describing works through the presented in the databases of interst (recreipt of manungerght) or previously violated (identification of HV) positive studus.) The outcome data is provided but as disolute differences and relative risks with and without controling for differences in the underlying populations. Though the sheer volume of information talkes time to work through the presented information allows the reader to clearly understand the results. The overall results as represented in the tables are well laid out. The discussion mostly relates the findings. The importance of angegement with a regular privary core site/phylician is highlighted access both populations based on enrollment</pre>	General	Strengths
(author This is an observational skulp of mammography rates over a 2 year period of time in women with and without HIV long in the province, comparing HIV positive women to the HIV negative peoplation. The question has increasing elevance as the province, comparing HIV positive women to the HIV negative peoplation. The question has increasing elevance as the province increasing elevance as the province increasing elevance as the province increasing HIV positive women to the HIV negative peoplation. The question has increasing elevance as the province of positive women to the HIV negative peoplation. The question has increasing elevance as the province of positive women in the age croup studied (50-74) and universal mamingraphy reminders sent by the provincial government to women. The methods are reasonably described. The impact of data linkages at the individual level is mentioned in the STROBE statement section but not in the bady of the manuscript. While data less oppears to be minimal a flow diagram describing this data loss capeers and the minimal a flow diagram describing this data loss capeers and the minimal and the weight and the section of the strategover and the section of the strategover the strategover and the section of the strategover and the section of the strategover the strategover the strategover and the section of the strategover and the section of the strategover and the section of the strategover the section of the strategover and the section of the strategover and the section of the section of the strategover and the section of the section of the strategover and the section and the section of the strategover and the section of the strategover and the section of the strategover and the section of the section of the section of the strategover and the section of	comments	
The serening decisions of HIV positive women. The methods are reasonably described. The impact of data linkages at the individual level is mentioned in the STROBE statement section but not in the body of the manuscript. While data loss appears to be minimal a flow diagram describing this data loss across the analytical framework should be included, at least for the HIV positive women. The analytical variables were either dearly definedied in the databases of interest (receipt of mammography) or previously validated (identification of HIV positive status.) The outcome data is provided both as absolute differences and relative nisks with and without controlling for differences in the underlying populations. Though the sheer volume of information takes time to work through the presented information allows the reader to clearly understand the results. The overall results as represented in the tables are well laid out. The discussion mostly reitarces the findings. The importance of engogement with a regular prinary core site/physician is highlighted across both populations based on enrollment versus non-amoliment and total number of visits. The limitations are reasonable discussed. We thank the reviewer for the careful review and thoughtful comments regarding our paper. Concerns 1. As mentioned above a flow diagram of data losses across linked datasets should be provided at least for the HIV positive women. The flow chart itself cannot be attached within the online text box provided, but is available in the uploaded text version of this letter. We would be happy to include this as a figure or appendix if the editors feel it would be helpful for readers. 2. The primary results paragraph is teste and difficult to follow. The santences following the statement of lower rates of breast cancer to readers. 3. The primary results paragraph is teste and affecult to follow. The subjet several pape 1, We have mede several changes to the results section to define the reader scale of both women appear to relate back to the full	response in bold)	Ontario Canada. The aim of the study is to describe breast cancer screening activities at the population level in the province, comparing HIV positive women to the HIV negative population. The question has increasing relevance as individuals with HIV continue to live longer lives and reach the age for a greater number of preventive services, including breast cancer screening. The study uses a number of linked databases maintained by the Institute of Clinical Evaluative Sciences (ICES), an agency funded to create linked datasets for observational studies of this type. The data sources and prior linking across the various data bases, which is done by ICE, are a great asset to the study and investigators. Given universal coverage for mammography in the age group studied (50-74) and universal mammography reminders sent by the provincial government to women in the age cohort the study environment provides an excellent back drop to examine
 Inits data loss across the analytical transwork should be included, at least for the HIV positive vomen. The analytical variables were either clearly delineated in the databases of interest (receipt of mammagraphy) or previously validated (identification of HIV positive status.) The outcome data is provided both as absolute differences and relative risks with and without contremation takes time to work through the presented information allows the reader to clearly understand the results. The overall results as represented in the tables are well laid out. The discussion mostly refercts the findings. The importance of engagement with a regular primary care site/physician is highlighted across both populations based on enrollment versus non-enrollment and total number of visits. The limitations are reasonable discussed. We thank the reviewer for the careful review and thoughtful comments regarding our paper. Concerns 1. As mentioned above a flow diagram of data losses across linked datasets should be provided at least for the HIV positive women. The flow chart itself cannot be attached within the online test box provided, but is available in the uploaded text version of this letter. We would be happy to include this as a figure or appendix if the editors feel it would be helpful for readers. 2. The primary results paragraph is terse and difficult to follow. The sentences following the statement of lower rates of breast cancer screening for HIV positive women appear to relate back to the full study population but this is impossible for the caugular galaxies and the analyses was are speaking to . In particular, we make sure to indicate the analyses that consider the campites cahor of both women with HIV? 3. The overall outcomes report non-adjusted results. The paragraph an page 10. We have made several changes to the results section to delineate more clearly the analyses was are speaking to the scandidary we may it is written. 4. Thanks		The methods are reasonably described. The impact of data linkages at the individual level is mentioned in the STROBE statement section but not in the body of the manuscript. While data loss appears to be minimal a flow diagram describing
 The overall results as represented in the tables are well laid out. The discussion mostly reiterates the findings. The importance of engagement with a regular primary care site/physician is highlighted across both populations based on enrollment versus non-enrollment and total number of visits. The limitations are reasonable discussed. We thank the reviewer for the careful review and thoughtful comments regarding our paper. Concerns 1. As mentioned above a flow diagram of data losses across linked datasets should be provided at least for the HIV positive women. The flow chart itself cannot be attached within the online text box provided, but is available in the uploaded text version of this letter. We would be happy to include this as a figure or appendix if the editors feel it would be helpful for readers. 2. The primary results paragraph is terse and difficult to follow. The sentences following the statement of lower rates of breast cancer screening for HIV positive women appear to relate back to the full study population but this is impossible for the casual reader to discern from the way it is written. Thanks to the reviewer to pointing out the challenges in reading this paragraph on page 10. We have made several changes to the results section to delineate more clearly the analyses we are speaking to. In particular, we make sure to indicate the analyses that consider the compared to discern from the way it is written. Thanks to the reviewer to pointing out the challenges in reading this paragraph on page 10. We have made several changes to the results section to delineate more clearly the analyses we are speaking to. In particular, we make sure to indicate the analyses indy consider the complexe consider the complexe of the ownen with HIV and women without HIV, and which are conducted among only women with HIV. We have also added subheadings for these analyses in order to improve the flow for the reader: "Analyses of women with HIV admi		this data loss across the analytical framework should be included, at least for the HIV positive women. The analytical variables were either clearly delineated in the databases of interest (receipt of mammography) or previously validated (identification of HIV positive status.) The outcome data is provided both as absolute differences and relative risks with and without controlling for differences in the underlying populations. Though the sheer volume of information takes time to work through the presented information allows the reader to clearly understand the results.
 We thank the reviewer for the careful review and thoughtful comments regarding our paper. Concerns As mentioned above a flow diagram of data losses across linked datasets should be provided at least for the HIV positive women. The flow chart itself cannot be attached within the online text box provided, but is available in the uploaded text version of this letter We would be happy to include this as a figure or appendix if the editors feel it would be helpful for readers. The primary results paragraph is terse and difficult to follow. The sentences following the statement of lower rates of breast cancer screening for HIV positive women appear to relate back to the full study population but this is impossible for the casual reader to discern from the way it is written. Thanks to the reviewer to pointing out the challenges in reading this paragraph on page 10. We have made several changes to the results section to delineate more clearly the analyses we are speaking to. In particular, we make sure to indicate the analyses that consider the complete cohort of both women with HIV and which are conducted among only women with HIV. We have also added subheadings for these analyses in order to improve the flow for the reader: "Analyses of women with HIV compared to women without HIV." The overall outcomes report non-adjusted results. The paragraph describing adjusted results appears to apply only to women who are HIV positive but this is only evident by referring back to the full cohort should be included. The HIV relevant results would then logically follow this information. We can appreciate the reviewer's concerns about the ease of following our results section. As mentioned above, we have made several changes and added appropriate subheadings to facilitate this flow. As tatement or short paragrap on the fredition soft on intrimatio		The overall results as represented in the tables are well laid out. The discussion mostly reiterates the findings. The importance of engagement with a regular primary care site/physician is highlighted across both populations based on enrollment versus non-enrollment and total number of visits. The limitations are reasonable discussed.
 Concerns As mentioned above a flow diagram of data losses across linked datasets should be provided at least for the HIV positive women. The flow chart itself cannot be attached within the online text box provided, but is available in the uploaded text version of this letter We would be happy to include this as a figure or appendix if the editors feel it would be helpful for readers. The primary results paragraph is terse and difficult to follow. The sentences following the statement of lower rates of breast cancer screening for HIV positive women appear to relate back to the full study population but this is impossible for the casual reader to discern from the way it is written. Thanks to the reviewer to pointing out the challenges in reading this paragraph on page 10. We have made several changes to the results section to delineate more clearly the analyses we are speaking to. In particular, we make sure to indicate the analyses that consider the complete cohort of both women with HIV and women without HIV, and which are conducted among only women with HIV. We was also added subheadings for these analyses in order to improve the flow for the reader: "Analyses of women with HIV compared to women without HIV" and "Analyses restricted to women with HIV." The overall outcomes report non-adjusted results. The paragraph describing adjusted results appears to apply only to women who are HIV positive but this is only evident by referring back to the tables and tracking the reported relative risks. A statement or short paragraph concerning the impact of multivariable adjustments for the full cohort should be included. The HIV relevant results would then logically follow this information. We can appreciate the reviewer's concerns about the ease of following our results section. As mentioned above, we have made several changes on previous work arowend competing demands in p		We thank the reviewer for the careful review and thoughtful comments regarding our paper.
 As mentioned above a flow diagram of data losses across linked datasets should be provided at least for the HIV positive women. The flow chart itself cannot be attached within the online text box provided, but is available in the uploaded text version of this letter. We would be happy to include this as a figure or appendix if the editors feel it would be helpful for readers. The primary results paragraph is terse and difficult to follow. The sentences following the statement of lower rates of breast cancer screening for HIV positive women appear to relate back to the full study population but this is impossible for the casual reader to discern from the way it is written. Thanks to the reviewer to pointing out the challenges in reading this paragraph on page 10. We have made several changes to the results section to delineate more clearly the analyses we are speaking to. In particular, we make sure to indicate the analyses that consider the complete cohort of both women with HIV and women without HIV, and which are conducted among only women with HIV heave also added subheadings for these analyses in order to improve the flow for the reader: "Analyses of women with HIV compared to women without HIV" and "Analyses report non-adjusted results. The paragraph describing adjusted results appears to apply only to women who are HIV positive but this is only evident by referring back to the tables and tracking the reported relative risks. A statement or short paragraph concerning the impact of multivariable adjustments for the full cohort should be included. The HIV relevant results would then logically follow this information. We can appreciate the reviewer's concerns about the ease of following our results section. As mentioned above, we have made several changes and added appropriate subheadings to facilitate this flow. 4. The discussion or interpretation section intially just restates the results. The initial paragraph adds little. The en		Concerns
 The flow chart itself cannot be attached within the online text box provided, but is available in the uploaded text version of this letter We would be happy to include this as a figure or appendix if the editors feel it would be halpful for readers. 2. The primary results paragraph is terse and difficult to follow. The sentences following the statement of lower rates of breast cancer screening for HIV positive women appear to relate back to the full study population but this is impossible for the casual reader to discern from the way it is written. Thanks to the reviewer to pointing out the challenges in reading this paragraph on page 10. We have made several changes to the results section to delineate more clearly the analyses we are speaking to. In particular, we make sure to indicate the analyses that consider the complete cohort of both women with HIV and women without HIV, and which are conducted among only women with HIV. We have also added subheadings for these analyses in order to improve the flow for the reader: "Analyses of women with HIV compared to women without HIV" and "Analyses restricted to women with HIV." 3. The overall outcomes report non-adjusted results. The paragraph describing adjusted results appears to apply only to women who are HIV positive but this is only evident by referring back to the tables and tracking the reported relative risks. A statement or short paragraph concerning the impact of multivariable adjustments for the full cohort should be included. The HIV relevant results would then logically follow this information. We can appreciate the reviewer's concerns about the ease of following our results section. As mentioned above, we have made several changes and added appropriate subheadings to facilitate this flow. 4. The discussion or interpretation section initially just restates the results. The initial paragraph adds little. The entire discussion seems to primarily comment on the findings of other studies for non-HIV p		1. As mentioned above a flow diagram of data losses across linked datasets should be provided at least for the HIV positive women.
 2. The primary results paragraph is terse and difficult to follow. The sentences following the statement of lower rates of breast cancer screening for HIV positive women appear to relate back to the full study population but this is impossible for the casual reader to discern from the way it is written. Thanks to the reviewer to pointing out the challenges in reading this paragraph on page 10. We have made several changes to the results section to delineate more clearly the analyses we are speaking to. In particular, we make sure to indicate the analyses that consider the complete cohort of both women with HIV and women without HIV, and which are conducted among only women with HIV. We have also added subheadings for these analyses in order to improve the flow for the reader: "Analyses of women with HIV compared to women without HIV" and "Analyses restricted to women with HIV." 3. The overall outcomes report non-adjusted results. The paragraph describing adjusted results appears to apply only to women who are HIV positive but this is only evident by referring back to the tables and tracking the reported relative risks. A statement or short paragraph concerning the impact of multivariable adjustments for the full cohort should be included. The HIV relevant results would then logically follow this information. We can appreciate the reviewer's concerns about the ease of following our results section. As mentioned above, we have made several changes and added appropriate subheadings to facilitate this flow. 4. The discussion or interpretation section initially just restates the results. The initial paragraph adds little. The entire discussion seems to primarily comment on the findings of other studies for non-HIV positive women as opposed to actually examining the data at hand. For instance, a possible explanation for lower rates of mammgraph screening in HIV positive women focuses on previous work around competing demands in primary care. This is somewhat at odds with t		The flow chart itself cannot be attached within the online text box provided, but is available in the uploaded text version of this letter We would be happy to include this as a figure or appendix if the editors feel it would be helpful for readers.
 Thanks to the reviewer to pointing out the challenges in reading this paragraph on page 10. We have made several changes to the results section to delineate more clearly the analyses we are speaking to. In particular, we make sure to indicate the analyses that consider the complete cohort of both women with HIV and women without HIV, and which are conducted among only women with HIV. We have also added subheadings for these analyses in order to improve the flow for the reader: "Analyses of women with HIV compared to women without HIV" and "Analyses restricted to women with HIV." The overall outcomes report non-adjusted results. The paragraph describing adjusted results appears to apply only to women who are HIV positive but this is only evident by referring back to the tables and tracking the reported relative risks. A statement or short paragraph concerning the impact of multivariable adjustments for the full cohort should be included. The HIV relevant results would then logically follow this information. We can appreciate the reviewer's concerns about the ease of following our results section. As mentioned above, we have made several changes and added appropriate subheadings to facilitate this flow. The discussion or interpretation section initially just restates the results. The initial paragraph adds little. The entire discussion seems to primarily comment on the findings of other studies for non-HIV positive women as opposed to actually examining the data at hand. For instance, a possible explanation for lower rates of mamography screening in HIV positive women focuses on previous work around competing demands in primary care. This is somewhat at odds with the actual reported results which indicate that among the entire population as the number of co-morbidities has no impact of the likelihood of receiving mamography. Another interesting finding in the secondary analysis is that immigration status is associated with lower overall mammography rates in the		2. The primary results paragraph is terse and difficult to follow. The sentences following the statement of lower rates of breast cancer screening for HIV positive women appear to relate back to the full study population but this is impossible for the casual reader to discern from the way it is written.
 3. The overall outcomes report non-adjusted results. The paragraph describing adjusted results appears to apply only to women who are HIV positive but this is only evident by referring back to the tables and tracking the reported relative risks. A statement or short paragraph concerning the impact of multivariable adjustments for the full cohort should be included. The HIV relevant results would then logically follow this information. We can appreciate the reviewer's concerns about the ease of following our results section. As mentioned above, we have made several changes and added appropriate subheadings to facilitate this flow. 4. The discussion or interpretation section initially just restates the results. The initial paragraph adds little. The entire discussion seems to primarily comment on the findings of other studies for non-HIV positive women as opposed to actually examining the data at hand. For instance, a possible explanation for lower rates of mammography screening in HIV positive women focuses on previous work around competing demands in primary care. This is somewhat at odds with the actual reported results which indicate that among the entire population as the number of co-morbidities increase the likelihood of screening increases while among HIV positive women the number of co-morbidities increase the likelihood of receiving mammography. Another interesting finding in the secondary analysis is that immigration status is associated with lower overall mammography rates in the general population but has no impact on screening rates among HIV positive women (though the results are impacted by very low numbers in some subsets of HIV patients.) Finally, while essentially all medical research papers end with more research is warranted, this study finds that across a population of just under 1.5 million women approximately 42 fewer women with HIV were screened compared to the rest of the eliaible 		Thanks to the reviewer to pointing out the challenges in reading this paragraph on page 10. We have made several changes to the results section to delineate more clearly the analyses we are speaking to. In particular, we make sure to indicate the analyses that consider the complete cohort of both women with HIV and women without HIV, and which are conducted among only women with HIV. We have also added subheadings for these analyses in order to improve the flow for the reader: "Analyses of women with HIV compared to women without HIV" and "Analyses restricted to women with HIV."
 We can appreciate the reviewer's concerns about the ease of following our results section. As mentioned above, we have made several changes and added appropriate subheadings to facilitate this flow. 4. The discussion or interpretation section initially just restates the results. The initial paragraph adds little. The entire discussion seems to primarily comment on the findings of other studies for non-HIV positive women as opposed to actually examining the data at hand. For instance, a possible explanation for lower rates of mammography screening in HIV positive women focuses on previous work around competing demands in primary care. This is somewhat at odds with the actual reported results which indicate that among the entire population as the number of co-morbidities has no impact of the likelihood of screening increases while among HIV positive women the number of co-morbidities has no impact of the likelihood of receiving mammography. Another interesting finding in the secondary analysis is that immigration status is associated with lower overall mammography rates in the general population but has no impact on screening rates among HIV positive women (though the results are impacted by very low numbers in some subsets of HIV patients.) Finally, while essentially all medical research papers end with more research is warranted, this study finds that across a population of iust under 1.5 million women approximately 42 fewer women with HIV were screened compared to the rest of the eligible 		3. The overall outcomes report non-adjusted results. The paragraph describing adjusted results appears to apply only to women who are HIV positive but this is only evident by referring back to the tables and tracking the reported relative risks. A statement or short paragraph concerning the impact of multivariable adjustments for the full cohort should be included. The HIV relevant results would then logically follow this information.
4. The discussion or interpretation section initially just restates the results. The initial paragraph adds little. The entire discussion seems to primarily comment on the findings of other studies for non-HIV positive women as opposed to actually examining the data at hand. For instance, a possible explanation for lower rates of mammography screening in HIV positive women focuses on previous work around competing demands in primary care. This is somewhat at odds with the actual reported results which indicate that among the entire population as the number of co-morbidities increase the likelihood of screening increases while among HIV positive women the number of co-morbidities has no impact of the likelihood of receiving mammography. Another interesting finding in the secondary analysis is that immigration status is associated with lower overall mammography rates in the general population but has no impact on screening rates among HIV positive women (though the results are impacted by very low numbers in some subsets of HIV patients.) Finally, while essentially all medical research papers end with more research is warranted, this study finds that across a population of just under 1.5 million women approximately 42 fewer women with HIV were screened compared to the rest of the eligible		We can appreciate the reviewer's concerns about the ease of following our results section. As mentioned above, we have made several changes and added appropriate subheadings to facilitate this flow.
		4. The discussion or interpretation section initially just restates the results. The initial paragraph adds little. The entire discussion seems to primarily comment on the findings of other studies for non-HIV positive women as opposed to actually examining the data at hand. For instance, a possible explanation for lower rates of mammography screening in HIV positive women focuses on previous work around competing demands in primary care. This is somewhat at odds with the actual reported results which indicate that among the entire population as the number of co-morbidities increase the likelihood of screening increases while among HIV positive women the number of co-morbidities has no impact of the likelihood of receiving mammography. Another interesting finding in the secondary analysis is that immigration status is associated with lower overall mammography rates in the general population but has no impact on screening rates among HIV positive women (though the results are impacted by very low numbers in some subsets of HIV patients.) Finally, while essentially all medical research papers end with more research is warranted, this study finds that across a population of just under 1.5 million women approximately 42 fewer women with HIV were screened compared to the rest of the eligible
		HIV positive women (though the results are impacted by very low numbers in some subsets of HIV patients.) Finally, while essentially all medical research papers end with more research is warranted, this study finds that across a population of just under 1.5 million women approximately 42 fewer women with HIV were screened compared to the rest of the eligible

may be somewhat overstated given the overall population impact of lower screening rates in the HIV positive population.
The reviewer makes important points about the interpretation of our data. In response, we have made several changes to the interpretation section.
We intended our analysis to convey two key messages. The first analysis, which included all women (with and without HIV) was intended to compare the prevalence of screening among women with HIV to those without HIV, after adjustment for potential confounder and predictor covariates. As such, aside from HIV status, we were less interested in the predictors of screening among all women as these have been documented previously. The second analysis, which was restricted to only women living with HIV, was intended to unveil predictors of screening among all women as these now presented details for both the unadjusted and adjusted models in the results section on page 11. One main limitation with this second analysis is it the smaller sample size among women with HIV, and we have ensured this is stated in the limitations paragraph of the interpretation section on page 13.
We have restructured the interpretation section to provide more context to our results. As per the editorial request, we have kept the purpose of the first paragraph to be to restate the main findings. In the second paragraph, we have compared our screening rates to other studies among women with HIV, and have described associations between patient characteristics explored in our study with those reported in the literature. In the third paragraph, we focused more succinctly our findings with respect to practice characteristics associated with screening. Finally, we have moved our recommendations to the concluding paragraph, and have tempered these recommendations to reflect this reviewers concern that we remain circumspect in our conclusions.
Reviewer 2 Dr. Michael Green
Institution Queen's University, Family Medicine, Kingston, Ont.
General Nicely written paper on cancer screening in HIV positive women. The study used population level administrative data and
comments was well done with appropriate methods and adjustments for known or postulated contounders. As with any study using
(author this sort of data there are some limitations but these are nicely documented in the paper.
hold) We thank Dr. Green for his feedback
we main bit of een for his feedback.
1. My only suggestion is that there be more specific detail about the existing literature on this subject. The references to
prior work in Utah and here in Ontario were too vague to allow the reader to easily see how these results support or
contrast with those form other studies.
We thank the reviewer for their feedback and hope the extensive changes to our interpretation section respond to his concerns.