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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

The authors have responded to our comments and comments from other reviewers in the cover letter. The information in the tables is presented in an improved manner, but the manuscript still needs to be edited by someone with greater fluency in English (not necessarily a native English speaker). For example, the first sentence of the Conclusion of the Abstract is hard to understand.

In addition, the organization of the paper could still be improved. For example, the authors could present their results in abstract in the following logical order: HIV prevalence, sexual behaviour, knowledge level, and sources of knowledge. For the Discussion section of the paper, the authors could summarize their results more concisely which would allow them more space to compare their results with other studies, either previous studies in Heilongjiang province or elsewhere in China. The number of references cited appears low.

Specific Comments

1. For table 1, suggest the authors put the percentage by the number, in the table so they could avoid narrating all the percentages in the text.
2. For table 2 (which is very busy), suggest the authors present only the “OR adjusted” values.
3. The authors mentioned there was low prevalence (12/1353) of intravenous drug users in MSM population in the Discussion section, however this result was not presented in the Results section.

Questions posed by Editor

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes.
3. Are the data sound?
Yes.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Need to be improved.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes, but writing style (English grammar and syntax) should be improved.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
No.