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Reviewer's report:

It is an interesting article for those operating in this field. It is important to address additional social and behavioral strategies for behavior change in Mozambique. As the authors articulate, there is relevance to investigate the interaction between adolescents and adults that may create a better environment for behavior change. I have a set of questions and suggestions:

1. Research question: as an evaluation, I missed more discussions about the outcome of interest that you used to evaluate the intervention. I believe that you considered the 'intention to change' as a predictor for behavior change, but you could have discussed more the theory and, as a consequence, the outcome. It is not clear in the methods or in the discussion section either. I missed an in-depth revision of the literature that would have prevented some issues in the intervention such as misconceptions about sexuality.

2. Method: I was not sure what is time elapse between the three intervention sessions and the in-depth interviews. What is reasonable following the Theory of Reasonable Action or Planned Behavior? I understood that 16 people participated in the intervention program. Why have you excluded three of them in the in-depth interviews. The reason presented in the text seems a bit vague.

3. Method: why were relatives excluded in the sessions? In Mozambique, family members play an important role on social norms related to the sexuality in their families. I am not sure how the Theory that promotes exactly the idea of a context and interaction allows the exclusion of an important element to change such relationships. Maybe the authors have to better articulate of meaning of expanded family in Mozambique and their role that exceeds the role that nuclear family has in Western societies.

4. Method: Line 14 of the "Description of the intervention" starting 'The sessions lasted approximately minutes". I believe it is missing a crucial information related to the length of each session. Also, it is missing information about the language of the sessions and the interviews; also missing information about the translation.
5. Results: the method to choose that community inform that 51%-66% of the women were illiterate. However, the majority of the interviews happened among high literate women (9 out of 13 had more than 8 years of schooling) and none of them were illiterate. This needs to be discussed as it seems an important limitation considering that the Theoretical approach is solidly based on cognition.

6. Results: method section states that half of participants were 25-49+. Actually, there was a woman who is 56 or 58 years old—or there were two women above 49. The narrative presents conflicting information about her age or it should be better described in the methods.

7. Results: There are statements about IUD that seems that it is wrong for a young person to use it as a contraceptive method. LARC is acceptable and recommended to be used as a contraceptive method for adolescents. The study does not address the risk of misinformation that this approach may entail.

8. Discussion: it is second page line 31, it states "interaction between individuals with different background, skills, and experiences leads to exchange". I found very little evidence about this variety of background and or skills.

9. Discussion: myths and taboos. The authors informed the implementation should address the improvement of correct information in the future. However, with little information on how the sessions were conducted, it is difficult to appreciate how future implementer should incorporate this finding in their programs. Moreover, it is surprising that "misconceptions on sexuality limited the intervention process" given the existing body of knowledge in this area.
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