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Reviewer's report:

I have reviewed the response to Dr Surinda Kawichai comments. Most points have been adequately addressed apart from the main point.

The authors divide men into three groups - those who did not go for VCT, those who went and had pre-test counselling but not the test, and those who completed VCT. Dr Surinda Kawichai asked the authors to do two analyses separately - one of going for VCT (combining those who only had pre-test, with those who had complete VCT) versus those who did not go for VCT and then a second analysis comparing those who had pre test versus those who had complete VCT, restricted to those who went for VCT. I agree that this would be very interesting and better than the analysis of those who did not complete VCT (combining those who did not go, with those who had pre-test only) versus those who did complete.

The authors then say the following in response:

We performed an unadjusted analysis of independent factors against the outcome which was categorized into men who had never had VCT at all; men who had ever pre-test counselled but not tested for HIV; and men who had complete VCT (pre-test counselling, HIV testing, post-test counselling). We then used multinomial logistic regression of the backward elimination model to determine association between independent factors and the outcome. The main finding was that younger males were 4 times more likely to go for VCT than older males.

Furthermore, younger males were 3 times more likely to have tested and received their results than older men. These results were similar to those obtained using the dichotomous outcome. However, to avoid confusion between the two analyses, we have not included the results of the multinomial logistic regression in the manuscript.

Although the authors response is not wrong, it would have been more interesting to see the results of the analyses proposed by Dr Surinda Kawichai. The authors are requested to at least include the results of their extra analysis or preferably include the analyses recommended by Dr Surinda Kawichai.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely
related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests