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Reviewer's report:

The authors have done a good job responding to the issues identified in the earlier review. Nevertheless, several issues remain.

Minor essential revisions

1. The authors should re-check the McEachan et al. [ref 13] article to ensure that they have selected the appropriate explained variance data; the 7.4% figure that they cite (p. 4, line 65) appears to relate to the amount of variance that attitude explains in past behaviour as opposed to intention or behaviour. Past behaviour is not the variable that is typically of interest; rather, it is intention or prospective behaviour. Given that the authors’ data relates to intention, the figures associated with intention should therefore be reported at the very least. The authors may wish to consult Table 2 of the McEachan article. This table provides values for specific classes of behaviour, including safe sex.

2. The authors should provide greater detail about the way in which they split intention to form the two groups (p. 12, line 258). It appears, for example, that those who on average scored 5 or more across the three intention items were deemed to fall into the ‘less safe sex’ group. Providing this information helps to contextualise the nature of the groups being examined.

3. The rationale for examining gender still needs to be strengthened. There are a number of articles that the authors could cite to bolster their case, including, but not limited to: Gender differences in risk taking: A meta-analysis (Psychological Bulletin, 1999, 125(3), 367-383); Safe sex? Misconceptions, gender differences and barriers among injection drug users: A focus group approach (AIDS Education and Prevention, 1993, 5(4), 279-293); Gender differences in beliefs about condom use among young, heterosexual Australian adults(Health Education Journal, In Press, doi: 10.1177/0017896912450240).

Discretionary revisions

1. On page 3 line 38, the authors discuss how sexual risk-taking behaviour is often motivated by a consideration of the positive consequences of unprotected sex. However, when the authors discuss their own results (page 13 line 291), the framing of this behaviour changes so that those who intend to engage in safer sex behaviours are more likely to nominate positive consequences of protected sex as salient. This shift in behavioural emphasis (from examining consequences of unprotected sex in the introduction to examining the consequences of
protected sex in the results) is potentially confusing as the positive consequences of the action will vary depending upon whether the action in question refers to protected or unprotected sex. The authors should therefore consider keeping their behavioural criterion constant across the paper.

2. Consider providing a stronger rationale for why the TPB was used to examine sexual risk taking (see page 3 line 44). The Albarracin et al. [ref 14] article may help in this regard as it demonstrates that the TPB has good predictive utility within this behavioural context.

3. Consider splitting some of the longer sentences to improve readability. See, for example, the sentences beginning: page 1 line 6; page 6 line 121; page 18 line 401

**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.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests