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“The Reasons for Betel-quid Chewing Scale: Assessment of factor structure, reliability, and validity”
Melissa A Little, Pallav Pokhrel, Kelle L. Murphy, Crissy T Kawamoto, Gil Suguitan and Thaddeus Herzog

Dear Dr. Foster Page,

On behalf of my colleagues and myself I would like to thank you and the Reviewers for the opportunity to revise our manuscript. We have addressed Point #3 by Dr. Chi, which is bullet-pointed below. For Points #1 and #2, Dr. Chi indicated that our previous responses were satisfactory; thus we did not respond to these issues again.

Sincerely,
Melissa Little

Reviewer: Lin-Yang Chi

Reviewer's report:
1. The authors have responded satisfactorily to my previous comment points 2, 4, and 5.

2. I raised the issue of sampling, and the authors’ response showed that they did not think that was a problem. It was not very satisfactory to me. However, in their response to the other reviewer (Saman Warnakulasuriya), they agreed that possibility of selection bias should be discussed. The limitations they added were enough for me.

3. Another point in my previous report was about the test-retest reliability and validity of the proposed scale. The authors agreed that these issues should be explored in future studies. I would suggest they add a few words about these issues in the limitation section.

• We thank the reviewer for providing additional comments to strengthen our manuscript. We have added the following sentences to our limitations section.

“Lastly, some people may chew betel quid without an explicit reason. Therefore, it is possible that they would provide different answers to the same RFCS items at different points in time. Because we were using a cross sectional sample in the current study, we were not able to test predictive validity and test retest reliability of RFCS. Given that the RBCS could be a useful instrument for assessing determinants of betel-quid cessation, it is important to assess its predictive validity. Future research should explore these additional tests of validity and reliability in a longitudinal sample.”