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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript is an interesting, theory-driven study that assesses the role of perceived family support on condom use among female secondary school students in Cameroon.

Major Compulsory Revisions: Please provide a table with the results of your associations between variables of interest. You state that no associations are significant and it is usual practice to show all data and statistical test results even if they are not significant. It is especially critical to do so in this case since the main focus of your work is around these associations.

In abstract, quantitative, descriptive and correlational research design is used. Not sure you need to say "correlational" in addition to quantitative and descriptive. Likewise, " disproportional, stratified, simple, random sampling technique" doesn't really makes sense. What is disproportional sampling? A simple random sampling design is not stratified. Perhaps good to clarify. In conclusion: I don't really understand when you say "This finding suggests that regardless of the sexual communication patterns within the family, techniques that increase the occurrence of parent and female student’s discussion concerning condoms and HIV/AIDS will prove useful in preventing HIV/AIDS among female students in Limbe Urban City of Cameroon.". You tested for sexual communication patterns and their effect on condom use. You did not find that sexual communication patterns with family members had an effect. How do you then conclude that "techniques that increase the occurrence of parent and female student’s discussion concerning condoms and HIV/AIDS" will be useful? I don't follow that logic.

Methods: It is usual to include the coefficients for validity testing. The measures do not have to be defined so precisely in the narrative text as they are clearly identified later. The main variable to be discussed would be the "perceived family support for condom use" [note that M is missing on condom]

Results: You should only report results in this section and move all commentary to the discussion section (or perhaps methods section when describing the variable as appropriate). As I mentioned earlier, please include a table of the levels of significance of the variables of interest. Also, it would be very interesting to see how an INDEX of the perceived family support for condom use behaved. Have you constructed an index of all or several of these variables? I think it
would be very helpful to do so in gaining an understanding of how family support may be affecting condom use.

I don't agree with your point that "the results of the study highlight the importance of encouraging communication about sexual health between adults and young people as this is likely to have an effect on perceptions of family support and therefore encourage the adoption of protective behaviour among young people." I don't think your study results as you have analyzed them shows this. You state that all association with individual variables are not significant. You have not shown that communication on sexual health has any impact on condom use.

Minor essential revisions: See note above about M on condom title

Discretionary revisions: The use of an index measure could be considered discretionary although I believe it would strengthen the results considerably. I am not sure that the author's suggestion to conduct a similar study among Muslim and/or male populations makes sense at this point given the lack of significant findings.
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