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Reviewer's report:

Title: Perceived family support regarding condom use and condom use among secondary school female students in Limbe urban city of Cameroon

This is an interesting manuscript in general and was improved since my first review; however there are still problems with some statements that I recommend to edit before this manuscript can be published. The majority of my comments are very simple and thus I am confident that the author will manage them without any complications.

- Discretionary Revisions:

Methods section:
The three high schools selected were the only schools in Limbe urban area? Or there are more schools but only three were selected? If the second, please describe how was this selection of schools done.

  - The sampling procedure for the three high schools has been included as the reviewer indicates

- Minor Essential Revisions:
None

- Major Compulsory Revisions: (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Results section:
I suggest to present the results from the section: “Associations between perception regarding family support for condom use and condom use” in normal plain text and avoid bullets.

  - The results from the section “Associations between perception regarding family support for condom use and condom use” have now been presented in normal text and not in bullets as indicated by the Reviewer

Discussion section:
On the first paragraph, please edit the phrase: “Single persons are predisposed to sexual temptations which might increase their vulnerability to STIs and HIV/AIDS”. Sexual temptations are not exclusive of single persons, but most
importantly, vulnerability to HIV/AIDS (especially among youth) relates to non-consistent condom use and the impossibility to negotiate its use. It is not a matter of being tempted or not, but having the capabilities and skills to use protection during sexual intercourse.

On paragraph seven, the author states that: “The finding suggests that the
perceived family support for condom use was creating much impact on condom use." It is not a clear phrase. What do you mean with "was creating much impact"? The term impact is generally used in the context of impact evaluation of interventions, which is not this case.

The author state that: “Clearly, these findings suggest that knowledge about condoms is not the obstacle.” As I referred in my first review, knowledge about correct condom use was not assessed in this study, and thus such statement is not adequate.

The lack of a more sophisticated statistical analysis should also be stated as a limitation of the study, unless the author explains why was decided to perform only a Ji-2. Maybe this was because it was an exploratory study??

- The phrase in the first paragraph “Single persons are predisposed to sexual temptations which might increase their vulnerability to STIs and HIV/AIDS” has now been edited according to the Reviewer’s recommendation.
- On the seven, the phrase “The finding suggests that the perceived family support for condom use was creating much impact on condom use” has been edited following the Reviewer’s recommendation.
- The phrase “clearly, these findings suggest that knowledge about condoms is not the obstacle” has been deleted following the Reviewer’s recommendation.
- The lack of more sophisticated statistical analysis has been included as one of the limitations.
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**Title:** Perceived family support and condom use among secondary school female students in Limbe urban city of Cameroon
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**Reviewer:** Patricia Coffey

**Reviewer’s report:**

Minor revisions
1. The author has done a good job of updating the literature for the background section. He should, however, identify the location of the various studies as they do not all pertain to the African setting. For example, he says: "Previous studies on parent-adolescent communication about sexual issues have therefore shown some association with condom use [10-13]." yet these studies are from the USA exclusively. The author can use this to reinforce his rationale for applying the theoretical models to the urban setting in Cameroon.

2. "self-completion questionnaires" should be "self-administered" which is what is in the abstract.

3. I don't understand how the probability sampling was undertaken. How were the class attendance registers used?

4. The coefficient alpha for the reliability testing should be included.

5. In my previous correspondence, I suggested the creation of an index to more fully measure the behavioral aspects of condom use. Instead of including this, I believe the author included a list of variable "measures". These details of the variables do not need to be included in this way and could be deleted.

6. Please state the denominator for the results since the proportions noted (%) response) for variables mentioned in previous paragraph are not the same.

7. The beginning part of the discussion is a bit choppy and could be made to read more smoothly; in particular, the author could expand the discussion around religion as a behavioral factor since his recommendation is to conduct the same research in other religious settings.

8. Table 1 is not necessary since the details are mentioned in narrative form in the text.

9. Table 4 is not necessary since the details can be easily integrated into the narrative.

- All the minor revisions have been attended to: “Self-completion questionnaires” have been changed to “Self-administered questionnaires”. The sampling procedure for the respondents has been elaborated. The coefficient alpha is indicated in the “measures section”, including the index categories. The “n” for each variable is included in the tables, so there is no need to put the denominators. The discussion on “Religion” has been expanded. Tables 1 and 4 have been deleted. “USA” has been specified to follow the references [10-13] in the introduction.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

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.
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