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This manuscript evaluated recreational drug use among MSM in Hangzhou, which is important. However, the manuscript is need to be further improved.

Abstract:

1, "Little is known about the patterns of drugs use among MSM." This is not true. I have at least review three papers on this in the last year, including one study from Shenzhen, one study from Peizhen Zhao et al.

2, for respective purpose, please change "subjects" to "participants";

3, "Programs should provide support to high risk MSM and provide interventions to mitigate the risk of HIV acquisition" this is too board, please be specify.

Background:

1, for the last sentence of P1 (line 49-51), refer to whom? MSM or general population. I believe it is among MSM. Be specify.

2, Short P2 (line 53-76)

3, the first sentence of P3 is awkward, please revise.

4, Line 96-106, Are Hangzhou MSM different from other MSM in China? If not, what's the rational for this study. Few studies (From Xu Junjie, Zhao Jin and Zhao Peizhen) have reported very similar results as this study, but few of them were did not mentioned in this manuscript, the
literature review of this manuscript is not enough. Please cite this paper and tell the readers what's new for this paper.

Methods:

1, the sample size calculation was based on which assumptions? If 400 people are enough, why 555 people were recruited?

2, "had anal sex with men in the last 3 127 months before the study" would exclude a large number of MSM, why this was chosen?

3, Why use "had previous HIV test results that were negative or unknown", HIV positive MSM would be another key group for the study.

4, for the measures, be specific, which categories were collected for each variable?

5, Since you excluded people with known HIV-positive status, what's the purpose to know "HIV infection, and MSM 167 who were HIV infected and used new types of drugs in the past 3 months"?

Results and conclusion:

1, 14.8% people were HIV positive, and the sampling is skewed to HIV negative and unknow people. The author need to discuss this further

2, what's the implication for the results discussed in P2 and P3 of the discussion part? The discussion in P2 is so boring, what's new messages does this finding bring to the existing literature?

3, P3 of the discussion is based on which finding? Should be combined with P4.

4, for P4 (line 288-291), please delete this sentence "Because higher educational levels were associated with 289 the use of new types of drugs, we assumed that educated MSM could have been more 290 familiar with the internet; and therefore, they may have had easier access to rush 291 poppers"

5, what's the main discussion point for P4?

6, compare P5 to SZ data, as well as the national data;

7, the authors have so many discussion points. Which are the three main findings/discussion points for this study? Pick out these three, and delete or combine other unimportant ones.

8, please rewrite the conclusion part, not just merely repeat all the results.
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