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Dear editor,

Greetings and hope you are in excellent health.

Thanks a lot for your input and patience. I did my best to meet all the requirements, corrections, and language corrections as required. Hope the revised manuscript will meet the scientific and language standards of the journal.

We asked two American graduates to revise and correct the language and the corrections are seen in the manuscript with the track changes. Additionally, we responded to the comments and corrections as follows:

1) Mann Whitney test is for ORDINAL variables (fix line 169)

Response: corrected. Please see line 178

2) Introduction section, lines 103-107 - need to be more specific to context and mentioning in Palestine

Response: Corrected. Please see lines 101 - 107

3) delete "analytical" (111)

Response: done. See line 110
4) delete 126-128, not necessary also delete 118 about raosoft as its out of place and repetitive. (but ensure its still referenced appropriately in the other line on Raosoft) there should be a separate paragraph break at least for sample size(at line 122)

Response: all is done. Please see lines 109 – 127 for the changes in these 2 paragraphs

4) lines 138-145 - there should be more context about what different categories are (is it low med high) - was this based on a published report ? how was that determined

Response: OKT scoring was not categorized and it was analyzed as continuous score. Please lines 144 – 145.

5) the range of scores should be provided for the OHBS

Response: see lines 148 – 161 for details regarding OHBS

7) Delete 192/193 - unnecessary /repetitive

Response: Done.

8) the section on Analysis of OKT scores is too repetitive of the info in the tables (i.e. the brackets too much info)

Response: Section has been re-worded. See lines 204 - 208

9) there is no discussion of doing internal reliability testing for the OHBS - and this was not an objective of the paper. Lines 204-206. More details on the validity and reliability of these tools should/could be given in the methods section instead.

Done. Please see lines 131 – 134 and lines 150 - 155

10) lines 213-227 need to be tightened up. some of the sentences have no context - e.g. what statements related to calcium?

Response: The whole section has been clarified. Each sentence and % was referenced to the item number in the OHBS. See lines 213 - 229

11) Low education is likely not the only reason. Higher educated people are not always knowledgeable either - and need to state that it could be due to low awareness, public health in your region related to OP?

The paragraph was reviewed. Please see lines 248 - 258

12) line 267 - where did this final statement about positive motivation toward health come from? didn't see evidence/discussion of this elsewhere
The sentences were revised. Please note the seventh subscale of OHBS is about perception of health motivation and the participants scored high in this subscale.

Please see lines 270 – 275 and lines 291 - 296