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Author’s response to reviews:

Responses to Editor and Reviewers

Reviewer #1’s comments:
1) Providing reason about the importance of the urbanicity scale.

   We address this issue “Discussion; page 16, line 22-25 and page 17, line 1-5”.

2) Place information about village size much earlier.

   We move this information to the “Methods; page 7, line 10-11”.

3) Make it clearer that the details of the study variables are in the additional materials.

   We make clearer statement about this advice in “Methods; page 9, line 5-7”.

4) Provide a table outlining the sources of data for each variable with some specificity.

   We added a column “Data Source” to provide more specific information about the data source for each variable in the supplementary file as well as adding more references in “Methods; page 8, line 4”

Reviewer #3’s comments:
1. Please use ’and’ instead of &. Please make it uniform throughout the manuscript.
We edited as suggested both in “Abstract; page 3” and throughout the manuscript and marked them in red.

2. Please unsert single space between et and al in “Background; page 5, line 44”.
   We edited as suggested in “Background; page 5, line 19”.

3. Remove “percentage” from the sentence in “Background; page 5, line 51-55”.
   We edited as suggested in “Background; page 5, line 22”.

4. Mention about possible bias from imputing some data for many municipal communities by the data of comparable villages in “Methods; page 7, line 44-52”.
   We address this comment in “Discussion; page 18, line 17-24”.

5. Rephrase the sentences in Methods; page 8, line 29-34:
   We edited as suggested in “Methods; page 8, line 16-18”.

6. Correct “7 components” to “6 components” in Methods; page 8, line 39:
   We edited the number from “7” to “6” in “Background; page 6, line 7”.

7. Correct spelling of “eigenvalue” in Results; page 13, line 46:
   We edited as suggested in “Results; page 13, line 22”.

8. Comment on the unidimensionality but low internal consistency of Dahly and Adair’s scale in Results; Page 14, line 12.
   We address this comment in “Discussion; page 17, line 10-16”.

Reviewer #4’s comments:

(1) English language should be improved.

   Our manuscript has been edited by the native English speaker.
(2) Provide additional reference for the interpretation of Pearson’s correlation coefficients on Page 10, line 39.

We added one more reference for this in “Methods; page 10, line 23”.

(3) Provide the rational for conclusion on P18 L22.

We address this comment in “Discussion; page 19, line 10-16”.

Editorial Requests:

(1) Ethics: Include an ethics statement which includes the name of the committee that approved the study.

We include an ethic statement and the name of the ethical committee “Methods; page 7, line 11-14”.

(2) Consent:

Our study is a cross-sectional study and utilizes secondary data. No data were directly collected from the participants.

(3) Availability of supporting data:

We presented in the main papers and additional supporting file.

(4) Authors Contributions:

We provide this information in “Authors’ contributions; page 21, line 13-16.”