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Reviewer’s report:

Major points:
1. It was not clear how the 351 adult betel-quid chewers were determined to serve the purposes of this study? Although the authors made it clear in the manuscript that this study was based on findings from a convenient sample, there are still issues to be addressed before readers could interpret the results properly, such as: were there adequate number of subjects for the minority subgroups, e.g. extreme numbers of chews per day, chewers of special types of betel quid?
2. Why only loading differences between genders were examined? How about those between different agegroups/ethnic groups etc?
3. Some people chew betel quid without being aware of any explicit reason. They may give different answers to the same question at different time point. The authors might need to justify their choice of method for assessing reliability and validity.
4. Are the three constructs identified by this study, i.e. reinforcement, social/cultural, and stimulation, valid for both chewing and quitting betel quid?
5. It may not be true that any cross-sectional study could not conclude causality, as stated in lines 320-321.

Minor points:
The symbol for the calculated statistical probability needs to be consistent. (line 213, P<.05, line 219, p<.0001)
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