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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript entitled: ‘reasons for non-use of condoms and self-efficacy among female sex workers: a qualitative study in Nepal’ addresses an important issue and aims to gain insight in the underlying motivation of this high-risk population not to use condoms. The study is conducted properly and the results reflect the work done.

This paper is not the first in its kind (neighboring countries, other at risk populations, …), and confirms the findings by other groups.

Clear study limitation are stated, placing the results in the right perspective.

Some remaining remarks include:

Major Compulsory Revisions

My most prominent comment on this paper goes on the structure. I feel that this paper is not structured well enough. The authors can bring more flow in the report: e.g. client refusal and decision making should follow each other. More structure is needed.

Also a clear distinction needs to be made between results and conclusions. E.g. page 11: ‘The FSWs who we interviewed did not use condoms for …’ is a conclusion, not a result. The other way around: page 15: discussion: third line: the results with foreigners are presented here for the first time.

I would like to ask the authors to elaborate more on the sample and sample selection. This study was conducted on a sub-sample of a cohort from another study. Please provide the selection criteria, as this is an important potential confounding factor (e.g. all participants recruited in bars, at home, …). Furthermore, how was this subsample selected? Also, I would like to ask to explain the sample size. When was saturation reached?

Methodology: explain in more detail how the analysis was done? One person analyzing or more?

Minor Essential Revisions

insert a table with socio-demographics (age, ethnic affiliation, marital status, …). E.g. for age, report mean (or median depending on normal distribution of the values) and the range (or inter quartile ranges), not like done in the manuscript now.
Remove episodes of interviews if they are not informative enough.
The manuscript needs to be spell checked by a linguist. Quality of English needs to be improved.
Some abbreviations are not explained
Subjective comments should be removed: p.12 ‘the so-called educated’
Define better paying partners/clients and non-paying partners/clients.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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