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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editors-in-Chief of Reproductive Health, 20110616

Thank you for forwarding the valuable comments and advice from the third reviewer.

We are submitting revised version 2 of the manuscript on the basis of the comments. In the manuscript, where we have added or edited is underlined.

Please consider our revised manuscript for publication.
Thank you for your kind consideration.

Dear Reviewer 3 (Prof. Kathleen F Norr),

Thank you for your consideration. We revised our manuscript according to your comments. Below is our response to your comments.

1. Background…We added literature review about school-based reproductive program in Tanzania and Sub-Saharan Africa, referred to studies targeting boys, and parent-child communication related to sexual health. We also added paragraphs in the discussion section.

2. Method…We added the time interval between pre-test and post-test in the method part. We clarified the objectives for the education program: (1) to teach and provide basic knowledge of the changes that occur in adolescence, and (2) to provide the opportunity for students to think about the decisions they may make in the future.

3. Measures…We referred to the Precede-Proceed Model when making the research proposal, although this was not closely related to this manuscript. Therefore, we deleted the model.

4. Practice… We referred to other relevant research articles. As you pointed out, the word “practice” does not fit to this program. Therefore, we changed the word “practice” to “behavior” instead.
5. Alphas…We did not write the significant level of alpha. Therefore, we added the significant level of alpha in the data analysis section.

6. Process evaluation…We added the person who conducted the process evaluation interview in the method section.

7. Analysis…We wrote more detail about paired t-test, and sub-group analysis, and about the characteristics of the subjects.

8. Results…Your suggestion is correct. The description of experience of sex was not related to the program. Therefore, we changed the order of description, including about characteristics of the subjects.

9. Knowledge…Table 6 shows the percentage of correct answers for knowledge. However, attitude and behavior do not have a correct answer. Therefore, we could not present the results like Table 6, but we tried to add some information about attitude and behavior in the method part.

10. Communication…Your comment is correct. The data regarding communication did not relate to the program. The description of the “communication” is moved to the characteristics of subjects.

11. Discussion…We know this trial was a very short intervention. This is one of the limitations of this research. We referred to more good quality systematic reviews and suggested near future plans related to this topic. We mentioned about sexual behavior and parent communication for health issues in this area. We proposed factors affecting decision making about reproductive health.

12. Limitations… We added the retention issue of this program; also that the next research proposal may include a long-term follow up evaluation and implementation in different areas.

13. Future plan…We deleted this section.