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Reviewer's report:

General
My recommendation is that the paper should be published if Table 2 is edited to be less confusing regarding the selected denominator for the percentages.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The information in the article is well-stated and useful. Interpreting Table 2 would be much easier, however, if indicators could be shown as a percentage of the total and any indicators for a sub-set of the total clearly labeled. There is some confusion as the table is currently laid out because it is not clear why the "N" shown beside the percentages changes. For example, if the total number of men interviewed in Lusaka is 366, why is the denominator for "any new sexual partner in the past four weeks" only 354? and the denominator for having sex with men only 348? If the total were used as the denominator, the table would be more understandable. If missing data cause the denominator to change, this should be indicated in some way.

Was the minimum age 18 or 19? It is stated as 19 on page 6, but perhaps it is 18?

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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