Reviewer's report

**Title:** Systematic Review of Effectiveness of School-Based Sexual Health Interventions in Sub-Saharan Africa.

**Version:** 4  **Date:** 12 November 2007

**Reviewer:** Nicole Crepaz

**Reviewer's report:**

General - None

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached) - None

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

1. Abstract:

Under "Results", add "published" before studies for "....., reflecting the paucity of studies..."

2. Page 5, Study Selection: Please provide the rationale why studies with cross-sectional design were excluded from the review.

3. Page 6, RE Rusakaniko et al study: If "individual" students were randomly allocated to intervention and control schools, then it seems to be "randomized" at individual level. However, if "groups of students" were randomly allocated to intervention and control schools, then it should be considered as group/cluster randomization.

4. Page 6, please provide the median/mean for the attrition rates.

5. Page 14, line 7: "Summary" should be "Similar”, right?

6. Table 1 summarizes the search strategy conducted in MEDLINE, EMBASE and CINAHL. It left out PsychINFO.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore) - None

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions
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Quality of written English: Acceptable
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