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Reply to reviewer #1

Compulsory revisions:

1. The reviewer suggested that we make more cautious claims in the discussion and conclusion, given the degree of uncertainty that always accompanies non-experimental research. Action: We rephrased parts of the discussion/conclusions.

2. Given that endogeneity is not a problem, the reviewer suggested that we could simply the presentation of results by dropping the results for the 2nd stage models. Action: We have dropped the 2nd stage results.

3. The reviewer pointed out that inclusion of the indicators for knowledge of a condom source and for the belief that one could obtain condoms may bias the effect of campaign exposure downward. Action: As recommended by the reviewer, we dropped those variables from the model.

Minor Essential Revisions

4. As suggested by the reviewer, we added the reference categories in the tables.

5. We corrected the typo on p.3, as well as a few others.

Reply to reviewer #2

Compulsory revisions:

1. As suggested by the reviewer, we have tightened up the introduction in order to better clarify the rationale for the paper and its contribution.

2. The reviewer suggested we clarify which of the programs emphasize family planning and which emphasized HIV, and to specify which family planning methods other than condoms were promoted by family planning programs. Reply: We agree with the reviewer that it would be helpful to have detailed information about the content about each of the programs. However, because program content often varies from broadcast to broadcast, our data would not enable us to fully distinguish between exposure to messages that focus on family planning versus those that focus on HIV. Because the focus of our paper is on the effect of program exposure on condom use within the context of HIV/AIDS prevention, rather than on the overall impact of the programs, we do not think information about family planning methods other than condoms promoted by the programs is needed. We revised the discussion section to explain how future research can be improved.

3. The reviewer requested that more information about the results from the endogeneity tests be included in the text. Action: As recommended, we included the results from
the significance tests in the results section on the effect of campaign exposure on condom use.

**Minor Essential Revisions**

1. The reviewer pointed out that some programs promoted family planning and not simply HIV prevention, which may cause some couples to use a contraceptive method other than condoms. The reviewer suggested that we seek to estimate this program effect as well. While we agree with the reviewer that this may be interesting, the focus of our paper is not to estimate the total impact of the programs, but rather to estimate their effect on condom use.

2. Like reviewer #1, the reviewer pointed out that the inclusion of the variables measuring awareness of a condom source and perceived ability to obtain a condom may cause an underestimation of the effect of the programs on condom use. Action: As suggested by the first reviewer, we removed these variables from the models.

3. As recommended by the reviewer, we provided more discussion about the limitations of the study.