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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Reviewer 1

1. Abstract section, line 38-43, page 2, we have removed the number of ORs and AORs;

2. Introduction section, line 72-75, page 3, when we mentioned “the demographic characteristics that were associated with high risk of CAI”, we just meant that there were plenty of articles concerned about the association between demographic characteristics and high risk of CAI among MSM, we cited one reference to explain it, but the reason of the association have not been explored from the perception of social communication, this is one of the purpose of our research, and we have explained the meaning of the social communication characteristics;

3. Methods section, line 140-143, page 6, we have removed the rescaling;

4. Methods section: during questionnaire investigation, we have asked the participants about whether they had had condomless insertive anal intercourse, in fact, most of these participants have had a lot of sexual partners, sometimes they had had both condomless
insertive and receptive anal intercourse with different partners or different situation, so we did not analysis this point separately;

5. Methods section, line 163-166, page 7, we have added the question and answer options related to the private or public place;

6. Methods section, line 173-174, page 7, we have added the question and answer options related to the internet or non-internet;

7. Methods section, line 159, 168, page 7, we have replaced of the variable name as place of first date and methods of meeting sexual partners;

8. Methods section: line 177-191, page 8, we have reordered the statistical analysis;

9. Discussion section: line 352-353 page 19, the result showed that MSM who seek sexual partners through internet had lower risk of CAI, it means HIV health education via the Internet could be effectives. So we recommend that more acceptable and innovative prevention programs should be developed using online technologies;

10. Discussion section: line 315-323 page 18, Zhongrong Y et al. reported a high CAI prevalence among MSM who were college students in China, but from previous research, MSM with higher education levels are well-known to have a higher HIV-related knowledge score. Our research indicates that highly educated MSM face resistance to the use of condoms during sex with assertive partners who may lack knowledge about HIV and that highly educated MSM may choose to avoid using condoms to cope with psychosocial vulnerabilities and create intimacy with other MSM. so, even our government has implemented series interventions target undergraduate students, to address this imbalance in awareness and bargaining power between partners of different education levels, the coverage of HIV-related knowledge awareness campaigns needs to be expanded to primary and middle schools.

11. English language in this manuscript have been improved by American Journal Experts.

Response to Reviewer 3

1. Discussion section, line 365-366, page 20, “PrEP using is not available through any legal way in Guangzhou during our investigation, so we did not collection the information about PrEP using.” We have stated this situation in discussion section;
2. Method section, line 198-209, page 8-9, dear reviewer, thank you very much for your suggestion, we have stated the details of the GENMOD procedure fits generalized linear models and GEE;

3. Results section, Table 2, page 22-23, in this table, we concern about the groups rather than individuals, so we did not analysis of ‘at least one CAI or non-CAI partner’ for each demographic category on a ‘per participant’ basis. But we replaced the supplementary file as Table 2;

4. Results section, Table 2, page 22-23, we have replaced UUAI as non-CAI;

5. Results section, line 256-258, 276-277, page 13, 15, We have stated the factors analyzed in the models for Table3, Table4 and text;

6. Abstract section, line 36, page 2, we have revised the relative risk as odds ratios;

7. Discussion section, line 297, page 17, we have revised the relative risk as risk factors;

8. Results section, Table 3, page 14, we have added all 95% CIs;

9. Results section, line 250-252, page 13, we have reported how the probability of CAI varies according to respondent characteristics;

10. Method section, line 168, page 7, we have replaced “method of making friends” as “Method of meeting sexual partners”;

11. We have added the information about the characteristics of communication between respondents and their sexual partners as additional file.