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Victor Minichiello, PhD  
Section Editor  
BMC Public Health

Dear Dr. Minichiello,

Thank you very much for your kind consideration on our manuscript, entitled “Factors associated with recent HIV testing among high-risk men who have sex with men: A cross-sectional study in Cambodia.” (MS: 1029313264164502).

We have revised the paper based on very constructive comments from the reviewers. We have also carefully addressed the additional Editorial Request. We would be very grateful if you could accept this paper for publication in BMC Public Health as a ‘Research article.’

Two attached files include a ‘Cover letter with a list of responses to reviewers R2’ and a 'Revised Manuscript R2’ with revised contents highlighted in blue.

Should you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Siyan Yi, PhD  
Corresponding author  
Founding Director, Center for Population Health, KHANA  
#33, Street 71, Phnom Penh,  
P.O Box 2311 Phnom Penh 3, Cambodia,  
Tel: +855-23-211-505 / Fax: +855-23-214-049  
Email: siyan@doctor.com
Responses to reviewers’ comments
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewer: Robert Magnani</strong></td>
<td><strong>Thank you so much for your efforts to review the revised manuscript.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Whether the data collected for an end-of-project evaluation or not fails to address the main issue concerning the sampling scheme used; that is to which population the results can be generalized. Because convenience sampling was used, generalizing the findings beyond the sample of MSM actually interviewed for the study has no formal scientific basis. The authors might argue that the sample is &quot;judgmentally representative,&quot; but they need to make a case for this. They need to compare the characteristics of the sample of MSM with other data or studies. They also need to address the issue of why they think that collecting data only form MSM found at hot spots and not from &quot;hidden&quot; MSM will not affect the results. The manuscript may be publishable if the authors address this issue more seriously.</td>
<td>We have addressed this concern in the limitations of the study. Please see lines 12-19, page 16. Our sample was only from reachable MSM under the coverage of the SAHACOM programs and do not represent MSM outside the coverage of the project or hidden MSM. Therefore we do not see the necessity to compare the characteristics of MSM in this study to those in other studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>