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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential
1. Abstract – Methods – put FGD abbreviation after focus group discussions
2. Background P4 last sentence of middle paragraph – not clear
3. Methods. The statement about sample size in the second paragraph needs more information to explain what the 383 was based on – was this the number required to have some stated power to be able to detect some stated difference considered important or was it the number required to obtain a 95% confidence interval of some desired width around an estimate? In this case the width needs to be stated.
4. P9 2nd to last sentence – rather than analysis performed at the 5% level of sig should say an analysis with a probability of .05 or less was considered as significant.
5. Knowledge score. Results of this are still not presented sensibly. The data has been used to call anyone in the top 50% of scores as satisfactory and the bottom 50% unsatisfactory. This means it does not matter how well or poorly the group did, 50% will be called unsatisfactory. This would be fine to used as an outcome to look at what factors influence their knowledge but is of no use in commenting on how well they did or what % were satisfactory. You defined this to be 50% - the only reason it differs from this is because of tied scores. As suggested last time you could quote the median score – ie that which 50% did at least as well as but it is no use quoting the number or percentage ‘satisfactory’ as has been done on the bottom of p11
6. Fig 1 is not showing cumulative rates. To present the % abstinent at each age (or the raw total number with the number abstinent as a subset of this) would be a perfectly good way to represent the data. What is presented at the moment is however confusing. Either the y axis should be the % abstinent at that age or if it is the raw number then the height of the bar should be the number in that age group and this should be divided into two colours for those abstinent and those not.
7. Table 2 – In my response to the query about the p values the overall ones have been removed for variables with more than 2 categories. This is unfortunate. The overall ones are the important ones which need to be there. The individual probabilities are the ones that could be dropped (or the table set out to make the overall ones clear)
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