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Dear Editor

We are grateful to the reviewers and yourself for the helpful comments and have addressed them as indicated below.

Title should be: Exposure to and opinions towards sex education among adolescent students in Mumbai: A cross-sectional survey

*Title changed.*

Background: Page 3, 4th paragraph: The following edits should be made:
In India, sex-related issues are often taboo subjects for discussion
Up until 2007 it had been implemented in almost 150,000 schools across the country

*The above changes have been made in the background section.*

Methods:
Page 4, 2nd methods paragraph there is a typo: ?a all"

*The ‘a’ has been deleted.*

Page 4, 4th paragraph: This sentence is not clear, ?The classes were not streamed by sex or academic ability but by subject studied.? Maybe change to, ?The classes were not organized by sex or academic ability but by subject studied.

*Changed as suggested.*

Results:
Page 5, 1st result paragraph characteristics should be characteristics.

*This has been corrected.*

The remainder (n=??) reported their religion as either Sikh, Zoroastrian, Sindhi, Dawoodi Bohra or having no religious affiliation.

*Changed.*

Page 5, 2nd result paragraph all p-values should use lower case p (here and throughout manuscript), p-values like p=0.00 should be reported as p<0.001 or p<0.01 as appropriate.

*All p-values have been changed to lower case p, and p-values that were 0.00, have been changed to p<0.001.*
Response to reviewer 2: Srikala Bharath

Why was the Logistic Regression Part of the study and the Table removed?
The logistic regression part and table were removed following previous reviewers comments recommending removing it, as the usefulness of the analysis was questioned in light of the fact that over 90% of students responded that they thought sex education was important.

We hope this meets with your approval and look forward to seeing the paper in print.

Yours sincerely

Dr Paramjit S Gill on behalf of the authors