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COMMENTS TO EDITOR

We would like to thank the Editor for his helpful comments and suggestions, which have greatly improved the quality of the manuscript.

1. By not taking up the suggestion to define penetrative sex (either as heterosexual, homosexual or both) the reader cannot determine if they mean both or not.

As suggested by the Editor, we have modified the abstract to include the percentages of heterosexuals (93.5%), homosexuals (3.5%), and bisexuals (3%) in the sample. In our opinion, these data complement and clarify the item regarding penetrative sex.

2. I cannot discern the meaning of this sentence in the abstract Regarding condom use, the female participants?

demand of a condom was the motivating factor that was the source of significant gender-based differences.

Is it?

a) Regarding condom use, the female participants?
   demand to use a condom was a significant gender-based difference.

b) Regarding condom use, the female participants?
   demand of a condom was a source of significant gender-based disagreement.

The authors should note that the abstract should be amenable to being read as a standalone item -- and not rely on the whole article to give the context of the meaning of this sentence.

The abstract and the text have been modified to clarify the meaning of the sentence. In this case, option (a) is the meaning that we wished to convey. Furthermore, the length of the abstract is now 345 words.