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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

1) Introduction: please specifically clarify some of the general statements, for example "in recent years" (which years?), "Asia" (which countries does this include?), "program strategies" (what are these program strategies and how are they similar/different?)

2) p. 3 - have there been any more recent estimates since 2006/2007?

3) Methods: In this context, what is the difference between the CBOs and NGOs mentioned?

4) Methods: Was this a basic cross sectional study or a cross sectional study following a particular intervention? The former is implied in most of the paper - but there is mention here of an intervention?

5) Methods: What are the "STI clinical services" that were generally available at these clinics? Testing only or exams and treatment?

6) Statistics: How was length of time in sex work measured and how were the categories for length of time in sex work determined? What about men who did sex work off and on rather than continuously, as is very common in other settings?

7) What was the median duration of time selling sex?

8) Results: How many clinic patients were approached to participate? How many were screened for eligibility? How many were excluded after screening and for what reasons?

9) p. 9 "possibly as a consequence" statement - this is speculation rather than a result and should thus be moved to the discussion section.

10) Discussion: As phrased, is seems like sentence 1 may not be supported by the results since a comparison of factors associated with HIV infection was not done separately for HIV infection among non-sex work MSM vs MSW.

11) Discussion: there was a large, significant difference in HIV/STDs between the two cities. This should be more clearly discussed and contextualized. Was this a
recruitment issue or perhaps reflective of broader trends of the MSM epidemic in these cities? This is mentioned but needs further development.

12) Discussion: In general, the discussion needs to be strengthened and clarified. It might include less details reviewing the specific findings and more focus and development identifying the most important findings, contextualizing them in other related research and identifying next steps.

13) Minor editing for language/writing throughout the paper is needed.

Discretionary:

14) Table 1: Demographics - consider adding the study city as one of the variables.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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