

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form ([see an example](#)) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Prevalence of, and risk factors for, HIV, hepatitis B and C infections among men who inject image and performance enhancing drugs
AUTHORS	Hope, Vivian; McVeigh, Jim; Marongiu, Andrea; Evans-Brown, Michael; Smith, Josie; Kimergaard, Andreas; Scroxford, Sara; Beynon, Caryl; Parry, John; Bellis, Mark; Ncube, Fortune

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Lucy Land Reader in Nursing Centre for Health and Social Care Research Faculty of Health Birmingham City University
REVIEW RETURNED	29-May-2013

THE STUDY	This is a survey not an RCT so some categories are not applicable. The research question is of interest and the survey is well explained, but the main outcome measure is buried within too many other outcomes and does not result in a clear message.
RESULTS & CONCLUSIONS	The authors have tried to present too many results arising from the question in the survey. This just creates 'noise' and the reader is left not really understanding of the significance of the primary outcome measure. The authors acknowledge the complexity of the problem and the limitations this presents, but in its present form the manuscript is not suitable for publication.
REPORTING & ETHICS	Consort statement not applicable.
GENERAL COMMENTS	This is a very interesting study which could provide useful evidence but the reporting of so many different results make it difficult to understand the main message.

REVIEWER	Professor Catherine Comiskey Director, Centre for Practice and Healthcare Innovation School of Nursing and Midwifery Trinity College Dublin Ireland
REVIEW RETURNED	03-Jun-2013

THE STUDY	Within the abstract the main objective and outcome measure is not clear. when reading the abstract one does not know which prevalence is being measured. Within the method can uteros be more specific and describe the survey as a cross sectional study design
RESULTS & CONCLUSIONS	While the results are well presented they are very descriptive and when reading them one can loose the overall message.

	The modelling results are probably the most useful for service providers
REPORTING & ETHICS	I don't recall reading within the manuscript that ethical approval and signed informed consent was obtained
GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you this was very interesting to read and it was informative. I would suggest that to improve the usefulness of the research that you focus on a key practical message for service providers.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

We found the two reviewer's comments interesting. In response to these comments we have made a number of revisions to the manuscript.

These are indicated by red text in the revised manuscript, briefly,

1. We have made the studies three objectives clearer by reformatting them into a 'numbered list' at the end of the Introduction.
2. We have made revisions to the Methods section to briefly give additional information on consent, ethical approval, and the study design.
3. The Results section has been substantially re-ordered and shortened. It now has three sections related to each of the three objectives. The findings are now also presented in the same order as the objectives are given in the Introduction.
4. A short paragraph has been added to the Discussion on the implications of the findings for service providers.
5. The Abstract and Article Summary have both been modified slightly so as to reflect the above changes.

We feel that these changes to the manuscript effectively address the two reviewer's comments

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Lucy Land Reader in Nursing Birmingham City University Birmingham United Kingdom I have no competing interest with this paper
REVIEW RETURNED	22-Jul-2013

REPORTING & ETHICS	Consort not relevant
-------------------------------	----------------------