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Reviewer's report:

Overall, the study design is OK.

However, there are some points that need further clarification. Some of them are:

1. Regarding the ethical approval, there is no explicit informed consent form and no mention about what would have happened if the participants refused to participate in the study. This should be clarified as the questionnaire is clearly not the integral part of the workshop.

2. It would be better to apply inferential statistics to identify the statistical significance of the observed changes.

3. You have mentioned in the conclusion that it has changed the attitude. However, the proof for this claim has not been substantially established in the article. The workshop does appear to have changed knowledge of the participants. Whether this change is statistically significant or not has also not been established as no inferential statistics has been applied.

The title of the table 1 in the annex has been mistakenly mentioned as "Table 2". Please correct it.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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