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Reviewer's report:

There are comments on the paper which also needs to be addressed. This has been uploaded.

Compulsory revisions
Justification for the study which should be part of the introduction
Clear description of how the sample was selected and questionnaire distributed and state whether they had the right power

Below are minor comments which also need to be addressed
Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The question as stated is okay. However, it gives the impression that the study will be generalizable to Tanzanian female students which is not the case.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The study design chosen is appropriate. However, there is no information given on whether the sample size chosen, they had 80% power and were 95% confident that they could answer the question they set the answer.

3. Are the data sound?
The data as presented is okay. However, the authors present almost a very unusual situation where there was 100% response rate for self-administered questionnaires! Were there any students who declined to participate and if so, were they different from those who participated?

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
The manuscript follows the required standard.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The discussion is okay. It is notable however that the authors seem to interpret differences in their findings vis-a-vis other studies as discrepancies! There are some data discussed which was not presented in the results section.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
The limitation discussed should have been addressed when setting up the study. It is not clear why the authors discuss sample size as a limitation since they should have included the right sample from the beginning.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
The authors do acknowledge the references. It is however not clear why this study was done to begin with since it does not seem to further what other studies had documented before!

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
The abstract covers the content of the paper. However, the title as noted above is not appropriate and should be revised to state the only universities covered.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
There are very many grammatical errors which the authors need to engage a native English speaker to help them improve on grammar.

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

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

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