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The Editor (s)

BMC

Subject: Revised Submission (Revision 2): Original Research Article

Dear Editor (s),

Thank you for considering our paper entitled “Cross-cultural adaptation of the short-form condom attitude scale: validity assessment in a sample of rural-to-urban migrant workers in Bangladesh” (New Title: Cross-cultural adaptation of the short-form condom attitude scale: validity assessment in a sub-sample of rural-to-urban migrant workers in Bangladesh). We appreciate the editor and reviewer for their valuable suggestions and inputs to improve the paper. Please find below our detailed response to the reviewer/ editors’ comments. The specific issues are addressed below and clarified/amended in the appropriate sections of the manuscript (please see the revised manuscript with highlighted changes).

We hope our revisions will meet with your approval criteria.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Tapash Roy
BRAC Health Programme
BRAC Centre (16th Floor)
75 Mohakhali, Dhaka-1212, Bangladesh
Tel: +88029881265; +8801712124335
Email: tapash.ro@brac.net; tapash_68@hotmail.com; Tapash.Roy@nottingham.ac.uk
Response to Editor's comment:

The authors have addressed the issues raised by the two reviewers of the manuscript. As a result, there is substantial improvement in the quality of the manuscript. However, I have also identified two issues that the authors need to correct before the paper can be suitable for publication in BMC Public Health. The details are provided below:

Comment: 1. There are several typographical mistakes in the manuscript. For example, the statement `They lager study..` should be changed to the `The larger study..` page 1; `Modified scale..` should read `The Modified Scale...` page 1; `This scale can help monitoring...` should read `This scale can be used to monitor the progress...` page 3; `whereby overall HIV...` should read `whereas overall scale ...page 3; `although variety of instrument...` should read although a variety of instrument...

Response: As suggested by the Editor, we have corrected typological mistakes throughout the manuscript.

Comment: 2. The authors have not compiled the references using the recommended BMC format; for example, all titles of articles should be in bold format. The authors should address this.

Response: We have now complied the references using the recommended BMC format.

Responses to reviewers’ comments:

Reviewer: Saifur Rahman

1. Title:
Comment: The study population needs to be specified. "Migrant Worker" refers to a big group of population.

Response: We have changed the title during previous revision (Revision 1) as suggested by the reviewer. However, as suggested further to make it more specific we have now rephrased the title as; “Cross-cultural adaptation of the short-form condom attitude scale: validity assessment in a sub-sample of rural-to-urban migrant workers in Bangladesh”. The study sample consisted of key population groups of rural-to-urban migrant workers (taxi drivers, garments and restaurant workers) in Dhaka; therefore, throughout the study we have specified the study population as “sub-sample of rural-to-urban migrant workers”, not as “migrant workers”. 
2. Abstract:

Comment: In the background, specify the study population. The method needs further clarification because the statements are confusing with regards to its link to the "larger study". I think the author only needs to mention about the method (mixed method: cross-sectional survey and focus group) they used for this particular study and mention about the link to larger study in main text. The results should not include the term that express opinion on the results, such as "good" or "bad" etc. Only present the results. Express opinion only in the conclusion.

Response: We have now corrected the abstract in the line of reviewer's suggestion.

3. Background:

Comment: The last sentence of the first paragraph needs to be rephrased. Spelling mistake "verity" in the first sentence of the 4th paragraph. In the last paragraph, is it "a vulnerable population" or "vulnerable population groups"?

Response: As suggested, we have rephrased the last sentence of the first paragraph and corrected the spelling mistakes.

4. Method:

Comment: The design needs to be re-written. In fact, it is not clear particularly the link between the presenting study and the larger study.

Response: We have re-written the study design section clarifying the link between the data presented in this paper and the main study.

Comment: As mentioned that the larger study included garment workers. Why the presenting study excluded that group? -- Needs strong rationale.

Response: We appreciate the reviewer for this point. The main sexual health study sample comprised taxi drivers, restaurant workers and female garments workers since they are considered as important population segment of rural-to-urban migrant workers in Dhaka. However, in order to capture the male perspective of condom use, the scale was not tested out among female garments workers.

Comment: The study targeted the taxi drivers and restaurant workers. Why the inclusion criteria does not have any reflection on the occupation.

Response: The occupation of the sample is now reflected in the inclusion criteria.

Comment: Instrument and data collection: Need to be re-written. Please start up what was done for the presenting study and than link with the larger study. Linkage between the presenting study and the larger study is confusing.

Response: As suggested, we have re-written this section clarifying link between data presented in this paper and main study.
Comment: As has been stated that this study followed a mixed method and the components of the mixed method included cross-sectional survey and focus group. Was the focus group to identify and finalize the items in the scale or to explore qualitatively the content validity and cultural equivalency? -- Very confusing. Needs clarification.

Response: We have now clarified the purpose of cross-sectional survey and focus group in the method section

Comment: Analyses: Nothing has been mentioned about the qualitative component of the study.

Response: We have now included a sub-section about the qualitative component of the study in the analysis.

5. Results:

Comment: What about the percentages of study participants by occupation? I am strongly recommending not to generalize the study participants as "migrant workers".

Response: As suggested, the percentages of study participants by occupation are now shown in the results. Throughout the study we never generalised study participants as “migrant workers” rather specified as “sub-sample of rural-to-urban migrant workers”, which is clarified in the manuscripts.

Comment: Should not have any opinion like "poor". The statement in the second paragraph "Mean score for .........." is totally confusing and needs to be checked. Scoring is confusing and needs clearly mentioned in the method section. The section on the results of focus group is not adequate.

Response: We have now clarified these issues in the result section in the line of reviewer’s suggestions. The focus group result section is now supported by statements of the participants.

Comment: 6. Discussion: the added/changed text need major editing. Many of the statements are not clear and the expressions are sometime complex.

Response: We edited the discussion section and clarified the issues highlighted by the reviewer.

Comment: General: My previous comments regarding inclusion and exclusion of the tables has not been addressed. The article needs a copy edit.

Response: We have already deleted table 2 & 4 during previous revision (Revision 1) as suggested by the review and cut down the total number of the tables from 7 to 5. However, we prefer to keep table 1 as we believe this will be helpful for the readers who wish to know more about the basic characteristics of the study sample.