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Reviewer’s report:

This paper reports the results of the first cross-sectional study focusing on sexual behavior and testing uptake among MSM in Cambodia. The study is well-conducted, the paper is well-written and the topic is very important in terms of public health. However, I have some major questions and comments in order to improve the analysis and the messages brought by this paper.

1. Title
The title should be focused on recent testing, since it is the main outcome of the analysis.

1. Introduction
The authors state “To the best of our knowledge, very few studies have been conducted on 16 sexual risk and prevention behaviors of MSM in developing countries”. There are numerous papers focusing on sexual behavior among MSM in Africa. It is likely different concerning recent testing. This sentence should be modified.

2. Methods
2.1 The testing history related question and the condom use question should be more details. It is important to note whether it is systematic condom that is used in the analysis.

2.2 Why using a p<0.05 for eligibility criteria in the multivariate model? It is more usual to use a less stringent criteria such as p<0.25, especially when the number of observations is not that high.

3. Results
3.1 Is there information about the current HIV status of the respondents? If yes, how does it affect the results?

3.2 The table 6 is not clear. Variables that are not significant after adjustment should be eliminated from the table, and from the model.

3.3 The variable “>5 partners” shown as NS is different from the mean number of sexual partner which is significant in univariate analysis. Why not using this variable in the multivariate model?

3.4 There are too many tables. Table 1, 3 and 6 should be fused in the same table showing univariate and multivariate analyses with different columns. It is not useful to show variables that are not eligible for multivariate analysis; they
need just to be listed in the text stating that no different was found concerning these variables. That’s why tables 4 and 5 are useless.

4. Discussion

4.1 The first § of the discussion is not clear. Do the studies that are cited related to recent testing or to life-time testing? It is more important to cite those who show data on recent testing since it the main objective of the present paper

4.2 I disagree with the sentence “In summary, this study highlights the common practices of risky sexual behaviors and relatively low rates of HIV testing among MSM in Cambodia” in the conclusion. The rate that was found though not optimal is far better than in many other vulnerable populations and in many countries…The sentence should be nuanced.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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