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Reviewer's report:

The authors have well responded to the criticism in the letter to the editor. But many of the responses are not added to the text of the paper. They include:
Chigbu: 1
Temmerman: 1, 2,
Stantton (I have numbered the comments in the order they were given): 2, 3, 4, 5.

As the future readers will not see the explanations and additions in the letter, this is not useful. I recommend revising the paper and incorporating the relevant sections of the current letter to the paper itself.

While reading the paper, I noticed a few more things, which might be changed to improve the value of the paper.

1. The paragraphs are long; breaking the text into shorter paragraphs might help readers.
2. Abstract Results contain only some of the key findings. Abstract Results could be more factual and detailed.
3. The methods of observations are not given (how many, by whom, where, how made etc).
4. The new chapter “limitations” suits better to Discussion; it could be expanded to include the other limitations, including the generalizibility from one area to the rest of Nigeria/ the studied state.
5. Relations= relatives
6. The authors do not refer to earlier similar studies. If there are none, that could be said.
7. The tables cannot be fully understood: the row variables need further clarification. When the questionnaire is added to an Appendix, reference to the relevant question might help. Another option is to use footnotes.
8. Discussion is too much on the policy/ recommendations and not on the paper itself.

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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