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Reviewer's report:

This paper describes the experience of sexual coercion among university students in Uganda. The paper is extremely well-written and clear. The questions used in the survey were innovative and impressive.

Discretionary revisions
None

Minor Essential revisions
1. The introduction is clear and well-written. It may benefit from a definition of sexual coercion as not all readers will be familiar with this concept.

2. The way that sexual coercion was operationalized is unique. However, some of the standard definitions of sexual coercion include sex that results from lack of power to refuse, from economic circumstances, and from threats, force and insistence, etc. The researchers focused on different types of sexual behavior, rather than the circumstances under which the action took place. It would be useful to understand what definition of sexual coercion was used and how they arrived at the questions to reflect it. This is mentioned in the discussion section. However, I believe it needs to be expanded upon and moved earlier, in the methodology section.

3. On page 12, the discussion of sample size is not clear and needs some revision.

4. In the Study Limitations section, the response rate of 80 percent is described as ‘quite high.’ I do not think 80 percent can be considered a high response rate.

Major compulsory revisions
5. As patterns of sexual activity usually differ markedly between male and female young people, I would recommend disaggregating the entire analysis by sex, from the beginning. For example, Table 1 is difficult to interpret since the statistics are presented in the aggregate. I would prefer separate columns for male and female respondents, making it easier to understand patterns among boys and girls separately. The influence of factors such as religion or mental health on sexual experiences may differ for girls compared to boys (though authors describe that their data did not support this). I would recommend dissagregating the analysis by sex for table 2 and 3.
6. The tables were, at times, confusing and difficult to read. I advise the authors to attempt a more reader-friendly or standard format for setting up their tables reflecting multivariate analysis, especially table 5.
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