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Reviewer's report:

This paper is well-written, straightforward and it adds nicely to the growing body of work that assesses this intervention's impact. The authors should be congratulated on constructing a convincing analysis. My only comments relate to a few typos, language pedantry, and some suggestions for more information.

Minor Essential Revisions:

Language and writing

1) p 6, line 127 suggests significance of p<0.1
2) p 10, line 206 suggests a significant relationship in spite of a p>0.05. The value is marginal so if the authors are going to make that leap then they need to be explicit
3) Most of the time exact p values are given but in a few cases the authors provide ranges (e.g., p 10, line 207; p 10 line 10). Just a small thing but somewhat distracting.
4) If a sentence starts with a number then the number must be spelt out. e.g., "Forty one per cent reported sex work..." vs "41% reported sex work..." (e.g., p 7 lines 142 and 143)

Information and detail

5) p 5, line 78; the authors indicate that only MSM with a new/unknown partner in the past week were asked about condom use with casual partners. This cut-off seems a bit short and I wonder if the authors could add a sentence about why they chose to exclude men who may have casual partners but not within the week before the survey.
6) The proportion of recruited MSM who reported sex work as primary income seems very high (41%). It would help provide some context for readers if the authors would add information about sex work in India, possibly by citing representative data around the proportion of men who report sex work.
7) A finding of the multivariate analysis was that a larger number of condoms provided seemed to predict less consistent condom use among men and their main partner, albeit with a small AOR. Aside from describing this finding, the authors never return to it in the discussion. It would be interesting for the discussion to include a sentence or two with possible explanations for this finding or at least some recognition that it runs counter to what one would expect.
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