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**Reviewer's report:**

This paper has been improved from its previous version and I appreciate the authors' efforts to address my comments.

Again, this paper underscores an important point about HIV prevention messages and although the methodology has limitations it still illustrates an vital point in the efforts against HIV.

I sense, however, that the paper focusses a lot on condoms and not nearly as much on the other proven HIV prevention measures such as abstinence and reduction of sexual partners. It is because it is easier to search for the term condom? The paper reads with a tone of anti-circumcision, pro-condom and ignoring the other prevention methods.

Furthermore, in the same way that the paper states the Daily Nation is providing biased information, I would say this paper is also (condoms > other HIV prevention modalities).

Another thing that gives the impression of biased reporting in this paper is that the results section includes' the authors' impressions or interpretations, such as "... were communicated employing a fairly negative or aggressive tone..." which I don't think is actually a result but possibly the authors' conclusion. Also the use of words like "interestingly" might be reserved for discussion or conclusions.

One sentence is repeated: "Also, when individuals were not provided, etc..." appears twice in a row page 12 my version.

Also on page 12 this sentence "While there were not any direct risks of complications from the procedure itself..." I think should read "While there were not any direct complications LISTED or MENTIONED TO BE associated with the procedure itself..." or something to that effect.

On page 13 there is a fragment "Though only two articles used the words 'partial protection' when referring to limitations of VMMC."

In general I think this paper is still too lengthy. I still believe it makes an important point but I don't think many readers will take the time to read it in its entirety and I think the same valid points could be made more concisely. This would make it more readable and accessible to a wider audience.
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