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Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary Revisions:
This is really an interesting manuscript. It shows clearly, what oral health professionals can do in developing country. The study design was based on mass media campaign and showed it as successful. The data is sound and the methods well described. This is a good manuscript.

I have only some minor suggestions for this manuscript:
p. 3. row 15. omit “then”
row 20 change “who seen” to “who had seen”
row 24 change “significantly was associated” to “was significantly associated”
p. 6. row 5 change : “visits were very low” to “visits were very uncommon or Rare”
p. 9. row 4 change “ characteristics of the respondents are shown in Table 1.” To “characteristics of the respondents did not differ between these groups (Table 1).”
row 8 change “did not seen” to “did not see”
rows 13-14 omit the first sentence and include (Table 2) after the second sentence
row 15 change “who seen” to who had seen”
rows 18-19 change in 39.1%, in 45.5% and in 15.4% to by 39.1%, by 45.5% and by 15.4%
p. 10. row 1, omit the first sentence and add (Figure 2) after the second sentence
row 15 omit the last sentence and leave (Table 3) after the second last sentence
p. 11. row 7 change “evidence suggest” to “evidence suggests”
row 10 change “literature indicate” to literature indicates”
p. 21. Rows 1-2, change “who seen the campaign and did not” to “who had seen the campaign and who did not”
Fig. 2 change knowledgein” to “knowledge in”

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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