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**Reviewer's report:**

Spelling mistakes:
Abstract, background: action(s)
Abstract, background: hea(l)th
Abstract, results: showing that (I am) a caring person
Background sixth paragraph: that that
Background seventh paragraph: known about known

Minor Essential Revisions

General remarks:
Use consistent terminology: young people, young adults, students, pupils, participants
References: [1-3] instead of [1,2,3]

Abstract:
The conclusion paragraph should be more specific. Which outcome expectancies are the most important (as mentioned in the title)? And what would the authors propose for health promotion campaigns?

Minor Essential Revisions

Background:
The background section is to elaborated. Paragraph 8 and 9 are examples (i.e. condom use and organ donation) and could be discussed and mentioned in the discussion section.

Minor Essential Revisions

Second paragraph: very long sentences of 4 or more lines, which make it hard to read.

Minor Essential Revisions

Tenth paragraph, last line: “The study population......... long term partners” should be written in the method section.
Minor Essential Revisions

Fourth and tenth paragraph: What is(are) the exact aim(s) of the article? And, please compare the lines below with the stated aim in the abstract (background).

Major Compulsory Revisions

- The present study examined the relative contribution of different outcome expectancies in determining young adults’ intentions to use condoms with casual sexual partners.
- And enables outcome expectancies to target through health promotion to be drawn out.
- It examines whether a measure of indirect attitude based on a subset of selected salient outcome expectancies has better utility compared to the full set.
- Also examines whether hedonic outcome expectancies associated with unprotected sex are more likely to be selected by those with less safe than more safe sex intentions to use condoms,
- and also whether health-related outcome expectancies are equally likely to be selected as important.
- by further examining the effect of gender on outcome expectancy selection.

Method

Participant’s paragraph: the information (i.e. age, gender and ethnic background) of the included 1051 students should be described in the method section instead of the information of the 1414 students.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Participant’s paragraph: How are the 363 (26%) excluded participants distributed across age, gender and ethnic background? Were some groups (males, females, ethnic minorities) overrepresented in this excluded group? And did the authors adjust for this in the analyses?

Major Compulsory Revisions

Participant’s paragraph “Ethnic minorities were more greatly represented”: Does this (i.e. cultural differences in condom use) influence the conclusion of the study? Please elaborate in discussion section. And did the authors adjust for this in the analyses?

Major Compulsory Revisions

Procedure paragraph lines“Eligible participants…….. aged 16-24 years”. These lines should be written in the participant’s paragraph.

Minor Essential Revisions

Procedure paragraph, lines “Data was collected……..desired age range”. These lines should be written in the participant’s paragraph or deleted.
Minor Essential Revisions

Procedure paragraph. The information is too detailed.
For example delete:
Seating was arranged to provide individual privacy.
A written quiz was provided........finished early.
Students were offered entry into a prize draw to win ........vouchers as.
At the end of the consent form participants had to select........ in order.

Minor Essential Revisions

Results
The results appears sound. However, I do not feel I have the expertise to adequately judge whether the analyses were appropriately done.

Discussion
A paragraph about the limitations of the study is missing. For instance the excluded 26% of participants and the 40% of ethnic minorities. When not adjusted for, these percentages influence the analyses and results of the study.

Major Compulsory Revisions
The content of paragraph one is repeated in the other paragraphs of the discussion. Please shorten the discussion by deleting these repeated lines.

Minor Essential Revisions

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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