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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We thank the reviewers for their hard work in reviewing our manuscript  
Below are our point by point responses to technical comments raised by editors and reviewers.

Technical Comments:

1. In the Ethics approval and consent to participate please clarify if consent was written or verbal. Also in this section please include details of whether informed consent (written or verbal) was given by parents/legal guardians for the participation of the children in the study. If verbal consent was given please explain why in this section.

Response: we thank the reviewer for this observation, in the ethical consideration for participation in the study has been clarified that, both written and verbal informed consent for participation were provided, some participants were unable to read and write a verbal informed consent was provided while others had to sign or have thumb print on written informed consent forms. For children participants only children with assent and parental consent were eligible for the study. This is indicated in the section of ethical consideration page 9 of the manuscript and in declaration section of Ethics approval and consent to participate page 21 of the manuscript.

2. In Funding, please state whether or not the funding body played any roles in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Response: we thank the reviewer for this observation. The funding agency had no any role to the design, data collection and analysis and manuscript preparation. This has been indicated in the section of Funding page 21

BMC Public Health operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.
Reviewer reports:

Salma AA Afifi, MPH (Reviewer 3): Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

Response: We thank the reviewer for this observation; the report is included in the box