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Reviewer’s report:

This is my second review of this manuscript. I note that the authors have addressed my major concerns in their revisions. However, the new text includes a number of errors that will require editing. I point out the ones that came to my attention here, but strongly suggest careful review and English editing by the authors before resubmitting the manuscript to the journal.

Background – last paragraph: Suggested wording: “…direct influence on intentions, and have some variance in common…”.

Procedure – 2nd paragraph - Not sure what “two dimensions for direct attitude” means – can you reword this phrase?

Results – Past STI Testing: In general, it should be STI testing, not STI-testing. End of that paragraph, delete the word “that”.

Discussion – 3rd paragraph: The sentence starting with “A possible explanation…” is not clear. Please revise for clarity. What do the authors mean by “good or bad” – “important” might be a better word. What do the authors mean by “lack of correspondence”? 6th paragraph: say “than” rather than “then”. Say “…other studies that suggest” rather than “who suggest”. 7th paragraph - say “This suggests that an intervention…” and say “students” rather than “schools”. 8th paragraph – “For example…..” - this is not a full sentence..I suggest, “An example of priming strategies would be to focus on certain beliefs in a movie and discuss these with the students afterwards. “ Last paragraph - say “essential” rather than “essentially”.

Conclusions – delete the word “now”.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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