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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions

Given the large distribution of hard-copy questionnaires (over 20,000 copies) and the availability of an online version, the final sample of 1,777 analysed is tiny. The authors should clearly acknowledge that limitation (ie., probably less than 10% response rate).

• In the Method-Analysis section, last sentence regarding content analysis, the themes were verified and then “named” and further reported. The word “named” is confusing, do the authors mean “labelled”?

• In the Results-response and sample characteristics section, 103 people were excluded because they gave no evidence of having an HIV diagnosis. To make it more explicit, do the authors mean “they did not self-report as HIV-positive” or “they did not specify their HIV-status in the self-report”? Also, a space mark needs to be inserted between “1217” and “male respondents”.

• While the authors compared their gay or bisexual sample with the SOPHID, should there be a distinction between the sub-sample completed paper versions vs the rest which completed the online version. As we know that an online sample tend to attract people from non-metropolitan areas, for example. It is also confusing while in the text the authors mention the comparison of this sample with the SOPHID sub-sample of HIV-positive people whose infection were homosexually acquired. In the table footnote, the authors referred to all PLHIV in the SOPHID in 2007. I suggest the authors re-format Table 1 too.

• In the Results-prevalence of problems with sex, in the first para, the authors stated that in terms of overall sexual problems “there were no significant difference according to age…”. But in the 3rd paper, the authors described differences in itemised sexual problems according to age, ART experience and years since HIV diagnosis. Need clarification on this issue. Why only bi-variate associations were examined not multivariate analyses to allow factors to be adjusted for each other (over and above)?

• Regarding four factors produced by the Principle Component Analysis, was Varimax rotation used? If so, need to mention that. Also, how much of the overall variance was accounted by Factors 2-4?

• In the discussion section, 3rd para last sentence, needs to insert a comma after “among MSM with HIV” before “they are…”. Also, need to elaborate that point
about these problems are not specifically related to being HIV-positive per se but also common among gay men or MSM?
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