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Author’s response to reviews:

Re: The Association of HIV testing with Social Norms, Self-Efficacy and their interaction among Chinese Men Who Have Sex with Men: Results from an Online Cross-Sectional Study

Dear Dr. Jeb Jones,

Thank you for your helpful comments on this manuscript. We have taken these comments and used them to make the manuscript stronger. Find below point-by-point responses, a clean version, and a tracked changes version of the manuscript.
Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely

Weiming Tang on behalf all the authors

Response to the comments

Response to Reviewer 1

1. The results as presented in Table 3 and described in the text should be revised. The odds ratios that are presented are not particularly meaningful on their own. As presented, it appears as though the coefficients from the model have been transformed to odds ratios. However, these coefficients need to be used in combination to arrive at meaningful ORs (e.g., the effect of self-efficacy in the presence of social norms). Please be sure that you are presenting meaningful ORs and that the table and text are appropriately labeled to make it clear which associations are being presented.

RESPONSE: Thank for your suggestion. We have revised this in Table3 and the result part. Line numbers: 229-234,238-243. Since our independent variables are continuous variables, we explained it in a different way without give a clear reference (The increase of odds with an additional point of the score).

2. There are some English-language issues remaining that should be addressed for clarity. Please check the text at the following line numbers: 77-78, 86-88, 93-95, 130 (should be ’informed consent’), 136 (tested ’for’ HIV), 141, and256-259.

RESPONSE: Thank for your suggestion. We have revised this in the paper.
3. Please define DAG.

RESPONSE: Thank for your suggestion. We have revised this in the statistical analysis part, we also added a reference to explain DAG. Rothman KJ, Greenland S, Lash TL: Modern Epidemiology; 2008.Line numbers:177,425

4. Please specify the selection bias that might exist in this study.

RESPONSE: Thank for your suggestion. We have revised this in the limitation part. Line numbers:307-309