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Reviewer’s report:

I am pleased to see that the authors have responded to most of the reviewers’ comments. However, I am still under the opinion that this paper needs substantially more work before it can be published. This paper still has numerous grammatical errors and typos. Some sentences are clearly not written (or edited) by a Native English speaker. I am still interested about why and how the dependent variables were selected for the regression. And also interested in why the independent variables were selected for specific regression models. Below I have some comments and suggestions which I hope will assist the authors.

Abstract: Some grammatical errors. Commercial and worker is redundant so should take out commercial. Last sentence in results: What does “appeared to be” mean? It either was or was not.

Introduction:

No need to spell out HIV/AIDS. We all know what it means and it takes up a lot of space.

Second sentence, 1st paragraph: “by far” is redundant. Please take out.

Last sentence, 1st paragraph: Declining is misspelled.

There are so many of these types of errors that I will not comment on all of them. It is hard to believe that this paper was reviewed by a native English speaker.

MARPS is no longer used. The term is key populations at risk of HIV exposure.

How do you know taxi drivers are a risk because they are young and have a wide range of contact?

There are several studies among taxi drivers and transport workers in other countries that should be brought into the introduction, especially when making statements like that above.

How can you say a few studies when you are just citing one study?

The last sentence in the second paragraph has absolutely no proof. Cite some studies from other countries to back up your statements.

Method and materials:

Taxi drivers of any age were eligible?

Key variables in the model:

I have never seen variables described in this manner. We do not need to know
how they were coded as we can easily see that in the table. The reviewers, including myself, were interested in how you decided on these variables. Literature is already plural so do not put and s on the end. Also, please state which literature you based these decisions on.

Where is your description for analysis? How did you decide on variable for adjusted ORs?
Tables.
Did you mean to have CIs in table 1?
Table 2. Why do you have no abstinence in lifetime rather than abstinence in lifetime with responses yes and now? It is confusing when you are having a double negative. Just put abstinence in lifetime and give the appropriate categories. Same with “Unfaithfulness” and “no condom use…”
What is primary and secondary abstinence?
What is CSW? You do not have this described anywhere else, then you refer to FSW.
The formatting of CIs in table 2 and table 3 are different (e.g., dashes vs. commas). No need to have more than two decimal points.
Table 3. No is usually the reference. Not yes. Your reference needs to be flipped.
Table 3. Did you adjust by age? Abstinence will likely be correlated with age. What type of adjustment did you do?
I still think the variables selected to look at the correlates (and the correlates themselves) are strange. I do not understand why you selected some independent variables and not others. What is the rationale?
Discussion
Please explain the implication of sexual intercourse while a partner is menstruating.
Sentences like this are not coming from a native English speaker: Our study showed a large proportion of taxi drivers and their assistants missed the opportunity to delay first sexual debut in their lifetime.
Nor is this: Non exposure to VCT service for this sub-population group led to unfaithful with their sexual partners and reduced their ability to use condom during sex with casual partners. This indicates that VCT service provision have been effective strategy as a package for HIV preventive behaviours.
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