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**Reviewer’s report:**

Perceived risk for HIV transmission among Police Officers: a qualitative study of potential volunteers for a phase 1/11 vaccine trial in Dar es Salaam.

**Comments**

1. **Title:** Having potential volunteers for a phase 1/11 vaccine trial in the title doesn’t make the title reflective. The issues discussed were not about phase 1/11 vaccine trials. Title may be changed to: A qualitative study of perceived risk for HIV transmission among Police Officers in Dar es Salaam.

2. **Background:** last paragraph. Line 6 from below: This explorative study has two parts (research questions). Research questions should be deleted. The sentence “Part one showed that potential volunteers ……………………………..among participants (9)” is not reflective. Is this a literature review? Is it a finding from the study? If this is part of a larger study that had been published earlier, the authors should recast this sentence and let it reflect this.

3. **Methods. Setting:** More descriptions of the study site are needed.

4. **Study design and sampling:** line 4: “We recruited diverse groups based on age, sex,…….” The authors should say that they recruited police officers based on age, sex, etc.

5. **Data Collection:** First paragraph. Line 6. “Results from the second question have been published elsewhere (9)”. This statement appears to contradict the last statement in the background section. Authors should reconcile these statements. Putting names such as EAMT, Joachim in the body of the manuscript to identify who did what is not necessary.

6. **Data analysis:** names and initials should also be deleted here.

7. **Results:** mean age of the participants should also be provided. Too many results were presented. Some spelling errors such as “diseased” instead of “deceased” should be corrected. Should be “deceased husbands” instead of “diseased men”. Authors should check again.

Dealing with causalities: “Other participants complemented that dealing with causalities may contribute 85% of risk……” More explanations are needed in this regard. Issues of wearing gloves were over flogged. There were too many results on this. Perhaps, the authors may delete some and present only the important ones.
8. Discussion: This section has not been well described. The first paragraph contained the results again. It may not be appropriate to start a discussion by giving all results again. Study finding should be well discussed and compared with other studies. It is not sufficient to only give the findings from other studies without properly comparing with the present study. Are the results similar or not, and reasons should be given. Second to the last paragraph of the discussion, just before the limitations. Eissien(27) was quoted but nothing was discussed. What were the findings of Eissien?

Overall comments

1. Title is not reflective
2. Research question was well defined
3. Issue of phase 1/11 HIV vaccine trial not well articulated in the background information. So it may be ok to delete it from the title.
4. FGD appropriate and well described
5. Data is relevant
6. Too many findings were presented
7. Discussion not well written

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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