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- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Title: The title needs to be rephrased. I would strongly recommend using the term “vulnerable” instead of “at risk” or “high risk” and please be consistent with this term. The study specifically targeted Bangladeshi migrant taxi drivers and restaurant workers, which should be reflected in the title. I would prefer a title like “Cross-cultural adaptation of the short-form condom attitude scale: validity assessment in a sample of migrant taxi drivers and restaurant workers in Bangladesh”

2. Abstract: Please re-write the abstract. A statement on scale should be in the background. The result section in the abstract does not properly convey the findings. Instead, the section includes comments on the study findings. In addition, it is not clear what the authors mean by “Culturally equivalent content was achieved for the scale in Bengali language.” Nothing has been mentioned about the easiness of using the scale and its cultural acceptability in the main result section of the article. The study was conducted on a very specified group of population. Therefore, the concluding remarks should acknowledge that instead of making a generalized statement, which could be misleading. (The concluding remarks can be based on the last paragraph of the discussion where the wordings: reliable and culturally standardized are appropriate.)

3. Background: Needs to be shortened. It would be better if the focus would only on condom use and its measuring scale.

4. Method: Needs to be shortened as well. Information in the sections: Design and participants and instrument are too detailed for a journal article. Authors need to focus on important issues rather than mention every bit and piece of things related to sampling, data collection etc.

5. Results: Table 1 is not necessary. Table 2 should also be deleted, as there is repetition of information in the text. There is repetition of information from table 4 in the text as well. I would prefer the text. Therefore, table 4 should also be deleted.
6. Discussion: The first paragraph is the repetition of information provided in the background. In fact, this paragraph can be used in the background of the study as it clearly describes the rationale and objective of the study. Also, putting this paragraph in the background would contribute in shortening this section as well.

7. Conclusion: There are repetitions of information provided in the background as well as in discussion. Please provide only a paragraph indicating ATC-B scale’s usefulness and future exploration.

- Minor Essential Revisions

I would like to suggest the authors to use the term “repeatability” instead of “Test-retest reliability”. “Repeatability” in this topic would be more understandable to the readers with non-statistical background.

- Discretionary Revisions

N/A

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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