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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

1. I don't like the double parentheses [(……)] in the AIM and in methods' section. Try to rephrase.

2. In many places you use the form " mean/SD score (47.69 ±20.17)". in my opinion it is more pleasant to read if it is presented as " the mean score for ......... was 47.7(SD 20.2)"

3. In Results (Aspects of oral and general health and health care attendance): no need to duplicate table 1 – numbers and percentages do not much exactly i.e :"Thirty eight percent of respondents reported ‘non symptomatic’ dental attendance, forty four percent ‘symptomatic’ dental attendance and 18% had never been to a dentist" while in the table the percentages are 38.2%, 44.1 and 17.6, respectively. I would keep only the information which is not in the table such as the mean number of conditions, distributions of problems, and refer for the table for the rest of data.

4. Also, the paragraph Bivariate and logistic regression results of factors associated with dental attendance is very unreadable. Too many numbers, which are hard to digest, even for those who understand the statistical figures (especially the MD,n,U,z which are less common in public health articles) . I would suggest preparing a cross tab for bivariate associations,(maybe for both dental and medical, to save space) before table 2 of the regression. Also something is not clear with the t and the brackets in the second row of this paragraph (also in the medical paragraph)

5. If you stated in Methods that significance level threshold was 0.05 – you don’t have to write "... were significantly (p#0.05)" again in Results. Same for the "non-sig." afterwards.

6. "After controlling for age, increase in khat dependency levels was associated positively (p=0.004,OR=1.14, 95%CI= 1.04-1.25) with symptomatic dental attendance, whilst higher social participation reduced symptomatic dental attendance (p=0.034, OR=0.98, 95%CI= 0.96-0.99)" (in Results, Bivariate and logistic regression results of factors associated with dental attendance): The first association is well presented: "was associated...." While the sccond is mistakenly claiming that "... whilst higher social participation reduced symptomatic...." – again – it is only association, not a proof of a causative factor. You may suggest, but only in the discussion, that according to the proposed
model, the social participation leads to lower attendance (why? Any proposed psycho-social path?)

7. (p=0.0005) (in few places) : <0.001 would be sufficient……

8. Table 2+3 : why only the significant p values of the 3rd model are bolded? Why not mark the significant factors in each model?

9. Also – justification of numbers needs improvement, and C.I's in table 3 are not bracketed.

10. "Tobacco smoking were not significantly associated…” was. No "were". Unless you mean smokers.

11. "Accordingly, social participation seems to enable khat chewers to regulate their khat chewing …..Social participation exposes khat chewers to a protective network that instills in them the value of non symptomatic attendance”.
   (Discussion, 2nd para.): you cannot say it enables them or "That instills them" Try more careful phrase such as : it may be suggested that….. Only qualitative research will let you clarify the reasons for that protective effect of social participation.

12. " this may underestimate the validity of these study findings.” (Discussion, limitations): the word underestimate seems wrong. It may lower, or weaken the validity.Try correct this.

13. "This study recruited khat chewers and there is no knowledge of the dental and medical attendance amongst non chewers from this community" (Discussion, limitations): in my eyes, this limitation is the weakest part of the study, and it has to be addressed and discussed further. What is known about Yemeni community health attitudes and behaviors? Why didn't you choose a group of non chewers?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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