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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors identified a series of beliefs that could be used to inform future interventions aimed at encouraging the use of condoms. Moreover, unlike previous studies, these beliefs were identified in a way that avoided the expectancy-value muddle, thereby providing an important contribution to extant literature. There are, however, several minor issues that the authors could address to further improve their manuscript.

Major compulsory revisions
N/A

Minor essential revisions

1. Clarify in the 3rd paragraph of the Analysis section the variable upon which the group splits were based. It looks as if this variable was one of the items used to assess intention, although this is currently unclear.

2. There were several typos or missing words in the manuscript (e.g., ‘outcome expectancies that that…’ in the 6th paragraph of the Introduction; ‘enables outcome expectancies to target through health promotion’ in the last paragraph of the Introduction; ‘may vary depending on the nature of partner’ in the last paragraph of the Introduction; ‘showing that a caring person’ in the 7th paragraph of the Discussion).

3. Provide a rationale/supporting evidence for why males and females are expected to be “differentially motivated by the outcomes of unprotected sex” (last paragraph of the Introduction). This is important given the centrality of the gender splits to the reported logistic regression analyses.

Discretionary revisions

1. Consider providing the attitude = #be formula in the introduction – this may help readers to further understand: (i) the expectancy-value framework; and (ii) the various expectancy-value computations reported in the Analysis section (2nd paragraph) and in the Results section (under the heading ‘predicting attitude and intention’)

2. Consider describing in greater detail the expectancy-value muddle and its implications for the interpretation of previous expectancy-value findings. One of the substantive contributions of this paper is that it provides unbiased findings regarding the beliefs that are thought to influence attitudes towards condom use.
However, this contribution may be missed if readers are not fully aware of the implications arising from the expectancy-value muddle and the effect that this has on previous findings.

3. Consider reordering the 2nd paragraph in the Introduction to improve the conceptual flow. Specifically, the sentence beginning “The measure of attitude derived using…” could be placed beneath the sentence beginning “The TPB further proposes that an individual’s…” This way, the reader is introduced to the notion of direct and indirect measures of attitude immediately after the different measurement techniques (i.e., semantic differential, expectancy-value framework) are introduced.

4. Consider re-ordering the beliefs presented in Table 2 in order from most salient to least salient.

**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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