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A very interesting research.

Page 8. L-7. Include the final sample size and how many did not want to participate. To make it clear. In the abstract is announced 566 but in this part is announced 3349 and not the 566, or the reasons why it is much less than planned. It is confusing. Please detail more.

Page 8. Can you detail a bit more the process of selection of individuals? was randomly or purposively selection? If it is random, then why there is not balance in the participation of women and men?

Page 8. L39-until Pag 9, L22. While knowledge in Sexual and reproductive health is important, is no less important the practice and attitudes. Here you mention that 2nd part is on Practice but nothing was worked on attitudes. Please explain why.

Page 8. L27-31. Can you mention what was the range of factor communalities of the knowledge part?

In general. There is no consistency in the use of terms for KAP survey and its informed results. Please verify this. You switch terms permanently and it is unclear. Please revise.

Throughout the results section it is only presented two elements of KAP: knowledge and sexual practices. Attitudes are not presented and not studied explicitly. Is this so? Why?

Page 14. L31. It is presented that "women are shown to have more information and adopted healthier behaviors related to sexual relations and use of contraceptives". Was gender approach included in the survey to deepen the "why" from attitudes section?. Attitudes can be different from men and women. And this difference could have been interesting to have, particularly when you present about use of contraception, risky behaviors.

The discussion section keeps presenting the results. Please keep each part well separated.
Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:
An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal