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Reviewer’s report:

In general, the paper have improved but still there are parts that need to be revised. However, Major Compulsory Revisions are needed in the paper as indicated below each question used for reviewing the manuscript:

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

Still I am not convinced whether this is an interview study or a questionnaire study, as there is still a mix in the text around this matter!

As open-ended questions have been used there needs to be an explanation in the section of data analysis how the responses was handled in the process of analysing data. Content-analysis, phenomenology, grounded theory, phenomenography or what?

Still there is a lack of information about demographic characteristics of the studied areas in comparison to the general population of Oman. This is needed to understand how representative the material is when judging the results.

How many persons were participating in the data collection as interviewers? Just a few or a lot of persons that did participate in the course? Please give the numbers.

Further as concerns analysis of data, it is not clear from the text what kind of statistical significance tests that have been used. T-test, Chi-squared tests, parametric tests, non-parametric tests or what?

In this section and in presentation of results (including tables) there is also a lack of information about what models were tested in the multiple logistic regression analysis. Please give information about

a) dependent and independent variables included in the models and
b) how you actually determined which variables that should be included in the models.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

The results section need to be presented in such a way that you are able to control the figures stated in the text! If tables are not included, please give so much information so that you are able to judge what is stated. E.g Paragraph 2 and 3 under Results.
Further, please check that data given in the text corresponds to the information in the tables, e.g table 2 and 3.

The Tables needs to be constructed so that they are self instructing. Thus, every information need to be included so that you do not need to find them in another section of the paper.

Please, do also check and give the exact p-values throughout the paper and do not mix levels of significance with exact p-values.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Please, see above!

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Please, avoid relating what is discussed in this text to the tables in the results section! Give instead evidence in terms of short findings to which you can relate the discussion. The discussion need to give more clear evidence to what limited knowledge means in relation to what has been studied.

Under limitations of the study there is still a lack of discussion of the influence of several interviewers and their background and what it does imply for the respondents willingness to answer and what information they are actually being able to collect! Please add! Advantages, disadvantages?! At the moment this section is to general and sweeping. Part of this information could also be given in the methods section.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   In the conclusion of the abstract and the discussion the concept of quality of life is raised. I think it would be better to talk about health as the paper really focuses on health promotion and disease prevention.

7. Is the writing acceptable?
   On page 6 in the paragraph starting with “Multivariate logistic regression analysis revealed that those with high school education or higher were 4.69 more likely…”. This sentence is not complete! Please make it understandable.

From the content of the paper it is not clear what the literacy level means for Omani people as concerns the studied area, please check the paper and be consequent when discussing this point.

Advice:
Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions.

Level of interest:
An article of importance in its field.
SUMMARY: An interesting paper investigating an important area. By revision it has improved but still work is needed to make it clear for publication, particularly as concerns methodological aspects and presentation of findings.