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Thanks for the constructive critiques

Response

• 1st sentence of Abstract needs to be revised.
  
We have revised the first sentence.

Background

• Remove second sentence
• Delete sentence 1 second paragraph
• Change sentence 5 to the following: The aforementioned findings indicate that children are very vulnerable to SHS exposure within the home.
• Expand sentence 1 paragraph 3 to included SHS exposure e.g. “aims to prevent tobacco hazards such as child exposure to SHS”
• Remove etc from sentence 1 paragraph 3.
• Change sentence 3 paragraph 3 to the following: “These amendments, also further aimed to reduce SHS in children by expanding the prohibition of tobacco use in any indoor area with the presence of pregnant women and/or children under the age of three”
• Delete sentence 4 paragraph 3.
• Change sentence 5 paragraph 3 to the following.
  
“While this act protects children and other non-smokers from SHS exposure in public spaces, and pregnant women and children under the age of 3 from SHS exposure in-doors it does not protect all children from SHS exposure within the home environment”

We have revised all sentences based on your comments.
Associated Editor

1. Re: May the authors clarify in the Abstract what "(?=0.05 to -0.06), for example," stands for? If it is the 95% confidence interval, then the estimate (?) should also be reported. Please use ",," as opposed to "~". A statement "An estimate (?) and its 95% confidence interval is reported" may be added to the Methods section clarify this issue. Furthermore, clarify what "+" stands for in 7.67±2.02, for example?

"~" means the range of β coefficients, arranged according to survey year and gender in Table 3, not the 95% confidence interval. In order to clarify this estimate of β coefficient, all the estimates have been changed by using “to” instead of "~" as following statements: “Having a positive attitude toward smoking (β=-0.05 to -0.06) and high household SHS exposure (β=-0.34 to -0.47) were significantly associated with a lower avoidance of SHS exposure. Comparing to girls, boys had lower scores in their knowledge of tobacco hazards; and this factor was significantly related to their SHS avoidance (β=0.13 to 0.14).”

A statement “β coefficients and its 95% confidence interval were reported in multiple regression models about confidence level as to the avoidance of household SHS exposure” is added to the Methods section (pg. 10, 1st paragraph). We correct “7.67±2.02” as “7.67±2.02 (mean±sd”).

2. Re: In the 3rd sentence of the last paragraph under the subheading "Sampling design and participants", use past tense!

We have revised the sentence.

3. Re: State the significance level that was used in the Methods’ section and this should be based on the p value. How was the significance level determined based on three factors: p value, ? coefficient and R^2?

We have deleted “β coefficients and R^2”.

4. Re: In the wave 1 survey, the female students were found to have a significantly higher score in regard to their knowledge of tobacco hazards than the male students (7.67±2.02 vs. 7.42±2.33). Nevertheless, the latter reported having a significantly higher score with respect to their attitude toward smoking than the female students (17.06±4.65 vs. 16.02±3.92). In the wave 2 survey, the male students reported that they still had a significantly higher score as to their attitude toward smoking as compared to their female counterparts (16.59±4.65 vs. 15.93±4.24). These comparisons appear not to be significant!!

The sentences have been revised with carefully checked (pg 11, 1st paragraph).