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Reviewer's report:

Generally, the question posed by the authors is scientifically well defined, the methods appropriate and results supported be the data. However, there are minor essential revisions that should done; the entire manuscript also need to be proof red to make minor grammatical and typographical correction to enable the reading public better appreciate the results/findings of the paper.

1. Minor Essential Revisions

• Methods: Under Variables and statistical analysis paragraph 2, the authors reported that “. . . multivariate model were selected based on the standard criterion of P<0.2 in bivariate . . .” and yet analysis was conducted at a level of significance at 5%. The reference provided is a book not accessible for cross-checking. In contrast, the authors further indicated in paragraph 2 under Associations that observed difference in sex in not significant (P<0.112). This does not appear right as the standard criterion is rather P<0.05, the authors should check and make the necessary changes

Study area and Population: Mbeya districts is clearly stated as rural but it is not clear in your writing result table 3 whether Mpwapwa is Urban

• Results: in the abstract, main results and conclusion sections, sex is mentioned as one of the significant predictors of condom promotion and distribution. This is not supported by the results from the data in table 3. Although the P-value for Females against male (Reference group) is 0.047 (which boarder line), the Confidence Interval (CI) of 1.00 to 1.71 is not significant as it includes one. The authors may therefore be better of excluding it and concentrate of factors that are significantly pronounced especially in the conclusion

Table 3: the labeling of “Good” and “Bad” for the question How would you feel being seen by a parent/guardian holding or buying a condom? Doesn’t appear appropriate and the authors could consider other labels for the label “Bad” in my opinion

Also, for consistency purpose the reference group should come first as is the case in the other variables. Is there any particular reason why “Good” was not used as the reference group? Could be that when the first category is used there is no significance?. This same applies to Sexual activity categories

Association: Since participants are mainly (about 94%) Christians, there is no bases for comparison
First sentence in paragraph 3 is unnecessary and may be removed

Multivariate logistic regression results: The third sentence in the 1st paragraph is hanging and does not make any meaning

Discussion: The findings of the present study in the 1st paragraph should be discussed in the context of current literature. How does the findings of the small proportion of adolescents accepting condom promotion and distribution for example compare with other findings in Tanzania or elsewhere in Africa? The references given at the end of the paragraph dates back 20 or 15 years ago, can we have some literature with the past decade (10 years or less?)

The words “fuel” in the 1st sentence paragraph 1 “would fuel them into sexual practices” and “allegation” in the sentence “the allegation that condom promotion among adolescents” are inappropriate and may be replaced with words like expose and perception respectively. The same applies to the word “robustly” in 1st sentence of paragraph 2

Limitations: The limitation should just be mentioned/discussed in one paragraph under the discussion section and not under a separate title called “Discussion”

The study is cross sectional survey and there may be need to mention this and discuss further the limitations

- Abstract: Under results, consider revising first sentence to read “The mean age of the 1327 participants (50.5% males) was 13.5 years (SD=21.4)”. Also, the second half of the sentence beginning with “belonging to the age group of 15-19” to end of the paragraph is incomplete and readers will not understand what you seek to convey. Revise it and add the missing words

- Abstract: Under conclusion, consider replacing the word “outweighed”

- Background: consider replacing the word “of” in the first sentence with “before” any intervention. The word “myriad” seem inappropriate in the second sentence. First sentence in paragraph 3 is unclear and needs revision. In paragraph consider changing the word “marketing” with “promotion” in the community

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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