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Reviewer’s report:

This is a well written paper and a worthwhile contribution to the literature. I offered comments as read the paper that could improve it, but there are no major barriers that prevent this from being a publishable manuscript.

Abstract:
1. The background makes some strong assertions that should be stated as hypotheses, if the research is to be considered valid.
2. It is unclear why females are surveyed.
3. Percentages are given without a denominator.
4. What was the dependent and independent variables of the logistic regression.
5. Over, the abstract could be more parsimonious and follow more rigorously a medical sciences format.

Introduction
This is nicely written and complete. Some additional references to recent papers on preferences associated with MC would be beneficial (this review has two) and to the broader issue of risk compensation.


Methods
Rather that said that this come from a study that is both qualitative and quantitative, and the qualitative is published elsewhere, this previous work should be discussed in the introduction, and it should be explicitly stated how this paper builds upon this existing knowledge base.
Why was logistic regression chosen? Why were the models chosen? Was there a conceptual model?? Should there have been corrections for clustering? Is there a potential for “participation bias”?

Results
This is a nicely written section. It is unclear what the authors mean by “preference”, as there is no detailed explanation of the dependent variables, nor any theoretical foundation given for this term (e.g. economics provides a guide for preference analysis). Likewise, it remains unclear if this is stated or revealed preference.

Discussion/conclusions
These are acceptable. Some more discussion about how medical circumcision could be made even more desirable would be beneficial to readers and policy makers alike.
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