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July 20, 2009

Editor, BMC Public Health

Dear Editor,

RE: MS:1782064971268841-The multiple sexual partner behavior among Chinese female undergraduates: a cross-sectional study

Thanks you very much for your comments and suggestions.

We revised our manuscript in the format requested by your journal and according to the comments and suggestions of reviewers and editor, responding to the comments listed below. Since the paper has been revised significantly throughout the text, we feel it is better not to highlight the amendments in the revised manuscript

During the course of editing the manuscript, we modified the title as “Multiple sex partner behavior in female undergraduate students in China: A multi-campus survey”. And we found it necessary to provide more detailed information and to make the discussion more in-depth. So, extensive revision and edit were done in the results and discussion sections.

Professor Kathryn L. Braun from University of Hawaii made important contributions to statistical analysis and interpretation of the results and extensively edited the manuscript. All authors agree to add Kathryn L. Braun as co-author.

I would like to re-submit this revised manuscript to BMC Public Health, and hope it is acceptable for publication in the journal.

Looking forward to hearing from you soon.

With kindest regards,

Yours sincerely

Shiyue Li & Hong Yan
Replies to Reviewers and Editor

First of all, we thank both reviewers and editor for their positive and constructive comments and suggestions. Reviewer’s comments are shown in bold, followed by our responses.

Reviewer #1:

Minor Essential Revisions
The quality of English test is not good. There are many sentences which may be difficult to interpret. It is requested that English text should be improved.
We have revised the entire paper to improve the quality of English test with the help of native English-speaking colleagues.

Reviewer #2:

1) Given that the study sample is a cluster sample (i.e., hierarchical data) recruited from sixteen universities, Multi-level logistic regression (not general multivariate logistic regression) should be used in this analysis.
Thank you very much for the suggestion. In the revised version of the manuscript, we have performed Multi-level logistic regression to analyze influence factors on multiple sexual partner behavior (see Table 5). To better interpret results, we provided more information in Table 5 and analyzed the predictors of ever having sexual intercourse using multi-level logistic regression (see Table 4).

2) In discussion, page 15 paragraph 2 the authors stated that “… there was no significant difference on the prevalence of multiple sexual partner behavior among female undergraduates of different ages…” same paragraph, the authors wrote “…younger students are more possible to have sex with multiple partners.” These statements seem to conflict with each other.
We have revised the discussion section according to the more detailed results and deleted those sentences possibly making readers confused.

3) English writing is poor. There are numerous grammar problems throughout the text. For example, in page 15 the authors stated that “However, what is noteworthy, because males were more likely than females to have multiple partners…”
We have revised the entire paper to correct the grammatical problems with the help of native English speaking colleagues.

4) The authors used many old reference articles (more than 10 articles were published 10 years ago).
We have searched related articles again and updated some references.
Replies to the Editors note and suggestions:

1. Further consideration of your manuscript is conditional on improvement of the English used - please bear in mind that as we are a free-access publisher, we cannot bear the costs of copyediting English ourselves. Please ensure particular attention is paid to the abstract. You should have a native English speaking colleague help you with this, if possible, or use a commercial copyediting service. Examples are those provided by the Manuscript Presentation Service (www.biomedes.co.uk), International Science Editing (http://www.internationalscienceediting.com/) and English Manager Science Editing (http://www.sciencemanager.com/). BioMed Central has no first-hand experience of these companies and can take no responsibility for the quality of their service.

According to your suggestion, we have revised the entire paper to improve the quality of English with the help of native English speaking colleagues. At the same time, we have paid particular attention to the abstract.

2. You must state the name of the ethical committee / institutional review board, which granted you permission to perform this investigation, in the Methods section of your manuscript.

We have stated the name of the ethical committee in the Methods section.