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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript entitled "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" deals with an important topic, which is of much relevance to the journal. However, I am afraid, in its current form, this paper is not ready for publication - indeed, it needs significant revisions, addressing some major concerns, before it can be accepted. Here are my concerns, comments, and suggestions which I hope will be helpful in revising the paper:

In terms of the rationale and justification for the study - not enough case is made in your paper. This needs to be addressed. What is new that people will take from your study and what contribution does your paper really make to the existing of literature in the field of psychosocial correlates of uptake of HIV, besides, of course, sharing another set of empirical findings? First, clearly identify the main points you would like to make in the paper. This gets lost in the current draft. Once the analysis plan has been streamlined, a reader can clearly walk through the major points that you are trying to make. In the process, what indeed could be the novel and interesting contribution of the paper doesn't come through. In short, I'd like to see an introduction that leads clearly and directly to the proposed hypotheses. Provide an introduction that focuses on a) what we already know from the literature on the association between social norm/self-efficacy and HIV testing. For instance, in your literature review you did not mention previous research articles that already demonstrated such relationships (e.g. [1]). b) What new concepts this study can address that make a distinct contribution beyond the prior studies on the association between social norm/self-efficacy and HIV testing. c) State the hypotheses of the research. If it is unclear whether self-efficacy and social norms can interact with each other, why you are not providing any theoretical basis for this (why and how these variables should interact?)?

Was a missing data analysis done, and if so, what was the procedure and the results? If not, why? I suggest the authors to consider imputation procedures recommended by Graham [2].

To investigate the interaction effect, you should calculate simple intercepts, simple slopes, and the region of significance as well as testing and probing the significant interaction following the recommendations of Preacher, Curran, and Bauer [3].
It is not clear to me what the theoretical and practical implications of the study are. At present I feel that the discussion focuses mainly upon description of the findings and not enough on the broader theoretical and practical implications of this data. I am left unsure as to what the meaning of the results are.

Please provide information on "follow-up purposes".
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Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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