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Reviewers’ Comments

Reviewer 1

1. In the method section, it stated that "Combined forward and backward stepwise regression was used to select of the final model, with p-value < 0.05 defining the criteria for inclusion." If p value was used as the selection criteria in the stepwise regression, should "Internet for information" be removed from the final model by the stepwise process given that the p was 0.72 and 0.60 (Table 3)? Thank you for this comment. Although “internet for information” did not end up being significant, it was still included in the final model because including this covariate made the final model a better fit/better explanation for all the data.

2. Given that the sample size for age 18-29 was only 21 (it would even be smaller after list-wise deletion in the multivariate analysis), it might not be suitable to be used as the reference group in the regression analysis (Tables 2 and 3). The insignificant results might partly due to the small sample size in this group. By looking at the OR for PIKQ-UI, they were quite different between 50-59 and >=80 and I wonder if the difference between these two groups was statistically significant. I would suggest using 50-59 as the reference group given that the sample size was the largest and the rank of its OR tended to be the lowest among all the age groups. Thank you for this recommendation. We have made these changes in the tables and in relevant areas in the manuscript. Making this change did not meaningfully alter the main findings of this study.

3. P.12 line 24 - "the magnitude was similar to that of lower educational attainment (OR: 3.58 vs.
3.18". The OR for education was 3.24 in Table 3. Please confirm.
Thank you for reviewing our manuscript carefully. This is indeed a mistake and we have made the appropriate change in the Discussion part of the paper.

4. Table 1 footnote - please change "Student’s t-test or Wilcoxon rank-sum test" to "ANOVA or Kruskal-Wallis test" as the comparison was for more than two groups.
Yes these are the tests we used as stated in Methods. We appreciate the reviewer recognizing this mistake in Table 1 and the footer has been modified.

5. Table 2 footnote - "Bivariate analysis was conducted on demographic/medical history variables with a significantly difference between proficient and non-proficient groups." What was "significantly difference" referring to? Did this mean variables were pre-selected to be included in the bivariate analysis based on some criteria?
This was stated in a misleading manner. Bivariate analysis was used to compare demographic and medical history covariates with knowledge non-proficiency. As this is already stated in the Methods and does not need to be re-stated in the footer of Table 2, we have removed it.

Reviewer 2 REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER

Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? Yes

Reviewer comments: The authors took careful consideration of both reviewers comments and made significant changes to the paper that have enhanced it considerably. I think it is suitable for publication in its current form.

We appreciate the reviewer’s comment.