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Reviewer’s report:

Minor Essential Revision
Ref(Methods Last line)(Page 10:Line 10,11). The authors have adopted a positive hypothesis and later disprove their hypothesis by using a critical p value (line 3 page 11). Therefore there exists a controversy with the critical p value (page 11; Line 3) and the hypothesis. Ideally the research work should adopt a null hypothesis, and disprove the same using a critical p value. Please review the research hypothesis appropriately.

2. (Background line 7): The text pertaining to references 3 and 4 is missing (deleted) It is recommended to retain the text since the information from Asian developing countries are important too.

Discretionary
1) one of the limitations of this study is that the investigators did not directly monitor the practice and behavior of the respondents. Kindly mention this in the limitations.

2) In Table 2: The authors are requested to re-arrange the toxic symptoms in order of decreasing prevalence for a better picture.

3) Table 1 describes the demography and this data is repeated in tables 3. Due to page restrictions and repetition of data, it is recommended that table 1 may be removed and the statistical differences mentioned in the result texts.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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