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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and valuable paper.

Major compulsory revisions

My main suggestion is to undertake some restructuring of the paper. I think this will bring out the findings more effectively. At the moment the results section seems to be rather akin to a clinical or epidemiological paper format where tables are presented, with limited discussion of what the findings may mean in that section. The quotes in the present version of this paper I presented in this way -- without the benefit of much interpretation by the authors. I think the `results' and `discussion' need to be treated rather differently. There are a number of pieces of information that are `results' in the discussion -- on pages 14 and 15 for example where background and additional information on the findings are given (i.e. information on where the barmaids come from). I suggest that each section in the results is expanded to provide discussion of the findings including any additional information (currently in the discussion) which allows the reader to understand the findings better. It might also be helpful to know if opinions expressed in the quotes were commonly held views among the respondents.

There are also, it appears, findings from participants on what should be done about the situation in Kasensero -- currently in the discussion. These should also be in the results rather than the discussion.

I suggest that some thought is given to the theme headings. I know the headings have been taken from literal translations (I assume) of what people said but `HIV Bank' is not immediately clear as a term to the reader. The heading `provocative dressing' may be interpreted as derogatory -- the quote from the woman who talks about the way they dress could be viewed as the uniform they wear to work to attract their customers! Perhaps the theme is `Clothing’?

I am not sure why the section on clothing is coupled with parental behaviour? In the revised version where each theme is discussed in more detail these can be divided up (and similarly other themes divided).

The abstract currently includes the terms mentioned above, which are not immediately clear to a reader scanning an abstract to see if the paper is of interest. But it also includes a long section in the conclusion which suggests what needs to be done. It seems a little odd that this section is longer than the results
-- I would condense. I suggest that local terms like `beach manager' which are not explained in the abstract are not used. Use a more general term.

I am curious about the use of the word `fisherfolk' in some places this seems to be used as if it is synonymous with fishermen/boat owners. The point of adopting the word fisherfolk was to provide a term which embraces all those who are engaged in fisheries including fish processors and traders. See Kissling et al. 2005 page 1940.

In terms of supporting literature the paper seems to be rather heavily reliant on internet review sources: KMCC paper, McPherson and Ann Gordon's reviews. I suggest the authors go back to the peer reviewed journals the reviews are drawn from to find material to engage with.

The bibliography needs careful reformatting so that the authors names include initials etc.

Table 1 -- are the authors sure that this does not include `too much' information -- i.e. information that would allow a local person with on line access to the internet and your paper to identify the respondents?

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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