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General comments

Although this paper presented a very well written comprehensive review of knowledge, attitudes and perceptions of WTS, the findings are not novel. In fact, similar results were obtained when compared to similar systematic reviews carried out in 2013 and 2014. However, the authors argue these earlier systematic reviews are out of date and did not go into details with regards University students. The authors further suggest that despite a high prevalence of use among university students there is no evidence that WTS use extends once students leave the university thus there is a need to explore this phenomenon. Yet the review itself does not specifically explore the question related to intention to continue or not to continue WTS after completing their University studies. It is therefore important to either reframe the study rationale (see pg 4; lines 28-30) or present data to support the gap identified by the authors themselves.

In general, I am not convinced that merely assessing knowledge, attitudes and perceptions towards WTS by itself is enough to inform intervention design as suggested by the authors.

Introduction

Pg 4; lines 28 - 30 - the whole paragraph on study rationale as it suggests here might need to be reframed as this study did not actually answer the question related to the uniquely high prevalence amongst University student cohort nor did it provide evidence of why WTS doesn't extends beyond the students stay at the University.

Pg 5; line 31; delete the word 'towards' and change word 'fail' to 'failed'

Results

Pg 7; line 101 -102; What is difference with this 'peer imitation" and "peer pressure" especially considering these were seemingly used in the same papers, i.e ref to 13, 15-17?
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.

Unable to assess

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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