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Major compulsory revisions
Methodology
1. The authors state (see except below), that “Consistent condom use (anyone who always use condom with every sexual encounter) which was coded as 1 for no (inconsistent condom use) and 0 for yes (consistent condom use) was the outcome variable where as socio demographic variables like age, sex, marital status, residence, occupation; relational and behavioural factors such as type of partners, disclosure of HIV status, knowledge of sexual partner’s HIV status, perception of stigma, substance use and member of association of people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA) were considered as an independent variables. Perception of stigma were assessed by using a set of 28 likert scale questions which were drawn from previous scale of stigma to address perception of stigma and HIV among PLWHA [13], and dichotomized based on the mean value of all likert scale questions.
2. The authors should either use “dependent variables” and “independent variables” or “outcome” and “exposures”, rather than categorizing their variables as “outcome” and “dependent variable”.
3. The authors have still not implemented my previous comments (1c. No description of what the Independent variables (socio-demographic, relational and behavioural factors) were.). Even though these are shown in the tables, it is common epidemiological praxis to describe how the variables in the analysis were categorized/grouped or even created.
4. The authors present a statement on ethical considerations (see below), which was immediately followed by a description of the analysis done in the study (without a proper heading “Analysis”. It would take a reader some time to find out where the analysis was written, thus making this a “hard” read. Once again, The authors have still not implemented my previous comments (2a The analysis
section was hard to find (there should be a heading “Analysis”). The analysis section should be separated from the ethical approval statement, with a proper heading “Analysis”. “Ethical approval was taken from Institutional Review Board of College of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Gondar. Data was entered and cleaned through EPI Info Version 3.5.1 and analysis was done by SPSS V. 16. Bivariate analysis were carried out to see the association of each independent variable on the dependent variables and those who had less than 0.2 level of significance were remain in to the final models. Finally, stepwise multiple logistic regression analysis technique was carried out and p value of less than 0.05 was used as a cut off point for declaring the presence of association. Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals were also computed”.

Discussion
The rest of the sections are greatly improved.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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