Reviewer's report

Title: Factors in the HIV Risk Environment Associated with Bacterial Vaginosis among HIV-Negative Female Sex Workers who Inject Drugs in The Mexico-United States Border Region

Version: 0 Date: 08 Jun 2018

Reviewer: Mantwa Chisale Mabotja

Reviewer's report:

This was a good written paper addressing an important public health issue. However, I have a few comments on this manuscript:

Title: The title is rather long and confusing. I think one can work on it to shorten it while still keeping the aim of the study.

Methodology:

1. The abstract is a bit confusing, making the methodology sound like it was a RCT while it is a cross-sectional study. Maybe try to explain this a bit better for the readers of abstracts.

2. The survey included questions that could be traumatic for the respondents, such as questions on childhood abuse. Were you offering any kind of counseling for the respondents should it be deemed necessary?

Results: The only result for Tijuana on the number of hours spent on the street was reported as a significant finding, however the 95% CI includes 1 [1.00-1.10], which basically deems the results statistically insignificant. This finding cannot be included as a significant finding when it is not, thus your whole discussion and results need to change and remove that finding. Removing this finding basically means there was not a significant finding for Tijuana, thus only one site had significant findings.

Limitation: I wonder if this being an interviewer-administered survey does not introduce some form of bias and social desirability in the response of participants? I would think the answer is yes. Please clarify how you controlled for this bias, if not, then it should be highlighted under your limitations.

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.

Yes

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

No

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:
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