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Dear Sir,

We would again like to express our satisfaction to you and reviewer 2 for taking the time to
thoroughly look at our manuscript for the second time and provide us with his feedback.

In light of the above, we have tried to provide a step by step response to the comments the
reviewer has put forward. Specific references to each change in the text (highlighted in yellow)
of the manuscript are noted. In addition, we are submitting the revised manuscript

REVIEWER 2

We are again very grateful for the necessary suggestions you put forward and clarifications you
requested. We have taken that into consideration and have made the necessary corrections.
Please see below the step by step response to revision requested.

Reviewer 2 Minor Essential Revision 1

Within the methodology section, the authors need to indicate for the scale of agreement and dis-
agreement that have been considered for the binary grouping in this study? i.e. what was the cut-
point for which this group is put under the “agreement” or “dis-agreement” groups?

Authors comment

We have added some text to further explain what you highlighted based on our
understanding of what you asked. Please see line 14 of the study questionnaire section and
also the third, fourth and fifth sentences of the data analysis section. If we have not
addressed your comment fully, can you please further explain what you are expecting and
also guide us where exactly in the methodology you are referring to? Thanks
Reviewer 2 Minor Essential Revision 2

The modified categorization of the age groups raise the attention to the newly calculated frequencies (proportions) which does not correspond to the earlier ones? Good if the author refers to these differences?

Authors comment

We do agree that there is a difference in the calculated frequencies with respect to age group as compared to the previous data presented. It was a mere oversight on our part not to have mentioned the reasons for the observed difference in our previous submission. After receiving the first reviewers report on our manuscript, we decided to thoroughly check our original data that was entered on the SPSS especially when the age group categorization issue was raised to ensure that the right information is presented. We realized that there were few mistakes in the data entry only for age group but all other variables were OK. All analysis were done again and those changes in calculated frequencies in age group were made (Please see table 1). The analyzed results presented in our previous submission do take into account those changes.

Reviewer 2 Minor Essential Revision 3

The CHBQ overall mean score (33.8 ± 1.3, 95% CI 31.146 – 36.412) is confusing as whether the presented 95% CI is derived from the 33.8 ± 1.3 operation (which does not corresponds?) or not? Good to revise.

Authors comment

Thanks for the observation. It was confusion on our part. We reported the grand estimated marginal mean score (33.8 ± 1.3, 95% CI 31.146 – 36.412) instead of the descriptive mean score {(34.9 ±4.5 (range 19-43)} which is the appropriate measure in this case as estimated marginal mean is the mean controlling for covariate (the means of the independent variables when the dependent variable is held constant at its mean value). We have done the necessary correction. Please see the abstract, results and discussion section of the manuscript.

Reviewer 2 Minor Essential Revision 4

The fourth sentence under the “Conclusion” section does not read well! A confusion can be established (with regards to the derived results) and worth considering a re-writing?

Authors comment

We have done the re-writing as you suggested. Please see the relevant part under the conclusion.
Reviewer 2 Discretional Revision 1

The first sentence of both the results and the conclusion sections are almost identical, the author may choose to improve?

Authors comment

We have also done that as you suggested Please see the first sentence of the conclusion

Reviewer 2 Discretional Revision 1

Good to follow the same categorization for both descriptive and analytical statistics which is not the case for the age group variable (one is categorical in the descriptive and binary for the analytical)?

Authors comment

Thanks for the suggestion. As was stated in the data analysis section of the methodology, binary coding was done for all categorical demographic variables only for doing inferential statistics. For age group, the coding was done based on the observation that most 1st, 2nd and 3rd year students are mostly between 18-26 years and the most 4th and 5th students were above the age 26 years. Therefore, we saw it appropriate that the inferential statistics results be presented in that manner.

Thanks very much once more for considering our manuscript and we hope that we have adequately addressed the concerns put forward by the reviewer 2 and hopefully looking forward to a favorable decision from the editorial board with regards to our revised manuscript.

With Kind Regards

Peter Bai James

Lecturer

Department of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry

Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, COMAHS-USL