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Author’s response to reviews:

Reply to the reviewer’s comments and changes in the submitted manuscript

1. In the previous draft (line 202), you said "62.9% (141) of the schools workers were < 40 years". In this draft (line 203), you said "63.1% (147) of the school workers were < 40 years". How do you justify the difference?

•Reply: The change in the number is due to the change made in recoding of age group; as in previous draft the coding was ≤ 40 years” and > 40 years; and in the new draft is < 40 years and ≥ 40 years. The latter is the correct coding. “Age group was measured by the following question “how old are you” using response options 146 (1) “19 years or younger”; (2) “20 to 29 years”; (3) “30 to 39 years”; (4) “40 to 49 years”; (5) 147 50 to 59 years; (6) “60 years old or older”. The original categories recoded into (0) < 40 years 148 (including original categories 1, 2, 3); (1) ≥ 40 years (including original categories 4, 5, 6)’’.

2. In the previous draft (line 203), you said "The majority 78.2 % (187) were teachers". In this draft (line 204), you said "The majority, 86.4% (204), were teachers". How do you justify the difference?

•Reply: Correction in (Line 204) “the majority 79.2% (187) were teachers”; the correct percentage is 79.2% (187) not 78.2 % (187).
3. Words such as "Occasional" and "Daily" express the frequency of use. Depending on the definition applied for "Current use", both "Occasional use" and "Daily use" can be forms of "Current use". According to line 143, recoding makes "Occasional user" different from "Current user". What is your definition for "Current use" to justify this difference?

• Reply: We agree, with the reviewer’s comment; the question didn’t define the terms. Changes made from “current use” is changed to “frequency of Toombak use”.

4. In line 149-157, for three questions you included the response option "I don't know" in the recoded category "Poor knowledge". But for one other question you included the same response option in the recoded category "Good knowledge". How do you justify the difference in recordings?

• Reply: in line 156,157 changes are made to the coding to read as follows: (“does Toombak use cause malaria” using response options (1) “yes”; (2) “no”; (3) “I don’t know”. The original categories recoded into (0) poor knowledge (includes original responses 1, 3); (1) good knowledge (include original response 2).

5. In line 171, the range of the sum score should be revised into (0-5). About the sum variable "Attitude towards Toombak use": What is the difference between a person who chooses “yes” only in one question out of 5 questions, and a person who chooses “yes” in all questions? The value for both of them will be 1.

• Reply: The sum variable "Attitude towards Toombak use" changed to

“Attitude of school workers’ towards their role in Toombak control”

• Attitude of school workers’ towards their role in Toombak control was measured by the following four questions (Cronbach’s α = 0.54); “school workers’ use of Toombak influences students use”; “schools should have a policy or rule specifically prohibiting Toombak use among students on school premises/ property”; “Have you ever advised a student to stop using or quit use of Toombak”; using the response options (1)” yes”; (2) “no”; (3) “I don’t know”; the original categories were recoded into (0) negative attitude (original categories 2, 3); (1) positive attitude (original categories 1). “How concerned are you about Toombak use among youth in your community”; using response (1) “very concerned”; (2) “Somewhat concerned”; (3) “Not at all concerned”. Original categories were recoded into (0) negative attitude (original response 3);
(1) positive attitude (includes original responses 1, 2). A sum variable was constructed ranging from (0-4). This sum was dichotomized into (0) negative attitude (initial scores 0) (1) positive attitude (initial scores 1-4).

•The change is due increased internal reliability Cronbach’s α from (0.34-0.54).
• Addition of the following questions “Have you ever advised a student to stop using or quit use of Toombak” “How concerned are you about Toombak use among youth in your community”
•Removing the following questions “Toombak should be banned in public places” ; “Toombak use by other people is harmful to non-users”; “Schools workers need specific training to be able to teach students how to avoid or stop using Toombak”.
•The sum variable reflects (0) negative attitude – having negative attitude on all included items. Whereas (1-4) reflect positive attitude of varying degree.

Abstract
Introduction
1. Line 26-27 “schools’ workers” changed to “school workers’ ”.

Method
2. Line 31 addition of “two-stage”.

Results
1. Line 36; 86.4% (204) changed to 79.2% (187).
2. Line 37 “current users” changed to “daily users”.
3. Line 37-40 addition of “Moreover, 19% (16) of ever Toombak users were ≥ 40 years and all of them were males (p<0.001). Age was the strongest predictor of ever Toombak use among school workers (p<.001)” instead of line (41-45).
4. Line 39 “only statistical significant” changed to “strongest”
5. Line 40 “male” changed to “female”.
6. Line 40 “positive attitude towards Toombak use inside school” changed to “positive attitude towards their role in Toombak control”.
7. Line 41 addition of “(p<05), and to report good knowledge”.
8. Line 41 “(OR 2.18, CI 1.00- 4.76, p<.05)” deleted.
9. Line 43 “(OR 2.81, CI 1.33-5.94, p<0.001)” deleted.
10. Line 43 “them” deleted.
12. Line 43 “poor knowledge” changed to “good knowledge”.
13. Line 44 “positive attitude” changed to “positive attitude towards their role in Toombak control”.
14. Line 44 “poor preventive practice” changed to “good preventive practice”.

Conclusion
15. Line 47 “associated” changed to “linked”.
16. Line 48 “positive attitude towards Toombak use inside school” changed to “negative attitude towards their role in Toombak control”.
17. Line 48 addition of “poor preventive practice”.
18. Line 53 “their negative attitude towards Toombak use” replaced by “positive towards their role in Toombak control”.

Keywords
19. Line 54 “SLT” added.
20. Line 62 “tobacco specific N-nitrosamines” changed to “the Tobacco specific N-nitrosamines (TSNAs)”.
21. Line 93 “attitude towards Toombak use” changed to “attitude towards their role in Toombak control”.
22. Line 105 addition of “about”.
23. Line 106 addition of “sampling procedure”.
24. Line 143 “Current use of Toombak” changed to “frequency of Toombak use”.
25. Line 156-158 “The original categories recoded into (0) poor knowledge (includes original responses 1); (1) good knowledge (include original response 2, 3)” changed to “The original categories recoded into (0) poor knowledge (includes original responses 1,3); (1) good knowledge (include original response 2).
26. Line 162-176 a new variable introduced “attitude of school workers’ towards their role in Toombak control was measured by the following four questions (Cronbach’s α = 0.54); “school workers’ use of Toombak influences students use”; “schools should have a policy or rule specifically prohibiting Toombak use among students on school premises/ property”; “Have you
ever advised a student to stop using or quit use of Toombak”; using the response options (1)” yes”; (2) “no” ; (3) “I don’t know”; the original categories were recoded into (0) negative attitude (original categories 2, 3); (1) positive attitude (original categories 1). “How concerned are you about Toombak use among youth in your community”; using response (1) “very concerned”; (2) “Somewhat concerned”; (3) “Not at all concerned”. Original categories were recoded into (0) negative attitude (original response 3); (1) positive attitude (includes original responses 1, 2). A sum variable ranging from (0-4). This sum was dichotomized into (0) negative attitude (initial scores 0) (1) positive attitude (initial scores 1-4).

27.Line 205 “86.4% (204)” changed to “79.2% (187)”.
28.Line 212 “84.5% (191)” changed to “55.3% (125)”.
29.Line 213 “52.6% (111) had a positive attitude towards Toombak use” changed to “86.1% (192) had a positive attitude towards their role in Toombak control”.
30.Line 221-232 changes in table (1).
31.Line 233-236 “good knowledge regarding Toombak use related health hazards was statistically significantly associated with preventive practices in schools as those engaged in these practices tend to report good knowledge (p<0.001). Whereas 89.6% (95) of females reported good knowledge, the corresponding figure in males was 79.8% (87) (p<05).” Replaced by “good knowledge regarding Toombak use related health hazards was significantly associated with teaching health issues (p<0.05) and preventive practices in schools as those engaged in these practices tend to report good knowledge (p<0.001)”
32.Line 236-238 “A significantly larger proportion of male school workers had positive attitudes towards Toombak use (p<0.05)” replaced by “Whereas larger proportion of females reported positive attitude towards their role in Toombak control than males (p<0.05). Ever Toombak user associated with negative attitude (p<0.001)”.
33. Line 273 addition of “attitude towards their role in Toombak control”.
34.Line 274-277 “Age was the only statistically significant predictor of ever Toombak use” replaced by “Age and perception of their role in Toombak control were significant predictors of ever Toombak use. The older group has the highest likelihood for Toombak use, with almost five times likelihood (p<.001)”.
35.Line 280 “ever” deleted.
36.Line 315 “supposed” replaced by “expected”.
37. Line 335 “ever users” replaced by “school workers”.
38. Line 337-338 “Half of the participants showed positive attitude towards Toombak use and with males more than females (Table 2)”. Replaced by “Majority of the participants showed positive attitude towards their role in Toombak control and with females more than males (Table 2).
39. Line 342-343 addition “school workers’ whom non-users demonstrated more high perception towards their role in Toombak control than ever user”.
40. Line 359 “associated” replaced by “linked”.
41. Line 360 “positive attitude towards Toombak use” replaced by “negative attitude towards their role in Toombak control”.
42. Line 360 addition of “poor preventive practice”.
43. Line 365 “negative attitude towards Toombak use” replaced by “negative attitude towards their role in Toombak control”.
44. Line 533 Table (4) addition of the variable attitude of school workers towards their role in Toombak control.