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“Predictors of condom use behavior among men who have sex with men in China using a modified Information-Motivation-Behavioral Skills (IMB) model”

Dear Dr. Anthony Idowu Ajayi,

Thank you very much for your letter and the review of our manuscript. We have carefully addressed all the comments and revised the manuscript as requested. Our responses to comments are detailed below.

We thank you for your positive comments and concrete suggestions, which provided very helpful to improve our manuscript. We hope that these changes will make the manuscript acceptable for
publication in BMC Public Health. If there are additional changes that we should make, please let us know. Thank you very much for your consideration.

Yours sincerely

Yi Yang

Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Guangdong Pharmaceutical University,

No. 283 Jianghai Road, Haizhu District, Guangzhou, China, 510310

Phone/fax number: +8602034055802; E-mail: yangyigz@163.com.

Response to comments on manuscript (PUBH-D-18-03583R3) entitled “Predictors of condom use behavior among men who have sex with men in China using a modified Information-Motivation-Behavioral Skills (IMB) model” submitted to BMC Public Health for publication.

Comments:

Anthony Idowu Ajayi (Reviewer 5): This study developed a modified Information-Motivation-Behavioral Skill (IMB) model to predict condom use behaviour among Chinese MSM. The study make methodological contribution to the field of study. Authors have greatly improved on the clarity of measures based on the reviewers comment. However, their power calculation is no correct. Authors should revise the sampling estimation to reflect consistent total sample size. The reported 890 and 1174 participants are inconsistent and misleading.

Response: Thank you for your positive comments. The sample size was pre-determined at the time of study design. The reported 890 was the minimum sample size required and had sufficient power for the study. Participants were recruited from six District CDCs and two community-based HIV service centers. All the MSM who met the inclusion criteria would be invited to complete the questionnaire from May to September 2017 using a convenience sampling method. In addition, the progresses of participant recruitment varied in different sample settings. Thus, a total of 1174 MSM complete the survey during the study period, and only 976 who had anal sex within the past 6 month were finally included in the analysis. In some previous studies, the calculated sample size was inconsistent with the final sample size [1-2], which was in line with
our study. So we didn't revise the pre-determined sampling estimation. However, in order to present the sampling method more clearly, we revised "the required sample size for this study was calculated to be 890" to "the minimum sample size required for this study was calculated to be 890", and revised "A total of 1174 MSM completed the survey" to "A total of 1174 MSM completed the survey during the study period".
