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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.

- 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.

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??
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