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Author’s response to reviews:
Reply to the reviewer’s comments and changes in the submitted manuscript

Response to reviewers
1. Prevalence of ever use Toombak is 22 on page 10 line 216. But this number is different in table 1. Example: age group <40(5) and >=40(16) => 5+16=21, Gender =21 and knowledge category =21. How do you justify the difference?

Reply:
The difference we used the valid percent for the numbers. The total number of Toombak users was 22 school workers. 1 subject failed to fill the question of age and question of knowledge and that was considered in the statistics.

2. I’m also not clear with your sample size because on page 5 under sampling procedure you were recruited a total of 239 school workers. But on table 2: Age group -310; gender-304; Teaching health issues- 313 and others. Similar problems on table 3 how could you justify these discrepancies? What is a percentage of non-response rates?

Reply:
The cross-tabulation of good knowledge and age group:
### Crosstab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Poor knowledge</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Good knowledge</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 40</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those reported good knowledge: 122
Those reported poor knowledge: 100
The total of participants: 222
Missing: 17

The cross-tabulation between positive attitude and age group:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 40</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=40</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those reported positive attitude: 188
Those reported negative attitude: 30
The total: 218
Missing: 21

Conclusion:
The two columns cannot be summed or combined as they are two different variables.

3. Your analysis part is not clear. Try to put summary of your analysis (Multivariate) on one table

Changes in the submitted manuscript

1. Page 1, line 8, (institute) changed to (department).
2. Page 1, line 10, affiliation changed to (Centre for Oral Health Expertise, Western-Hordaland, Bergen, Norway).
3. Page 2, line 26 (aims) changed to (aimed), line 28 (assesses) change to (assessed).
4. Page 2, line 31, (school) and (based) were added and (questionnaire, design) deleted
5. Page 2, line 31 (a two) changed to (one).
6. Page 2, the sentence (Most of the school workers reported good knowledge, positive attitude towards their role in Toombak control and good preventive practice) changed from line (45-46) to line (39-41).
7. Page 3, line 47 (linked) changed to (associated)
8. Page 3, line 50 (capabilities) changed to (potential)
9. Page 3, line 51 (moreover) changed to (on the other hand)
10. Page 4, line 73 (one of ) is added
11. Page 4, line 87 (school workers) changed to (their)
12. Page 4, line 87 (and thus may influence their Toombak related behaviour) is deleted
13. Page 5, line 155, (school-based) is added
14. Page 5, line 119, (were) changed to (was)
15. Page 5, line 120, new reference added
16. Page 5, line 121-123, the following sentence is deleted (It has been estimated that these four schools in each locality would provide a satisfactory sample size that was calculated beforehand for the study of the secondary school's students)
17. Page 6, line 128, (recruited) deleted and the sentence (invited and accepted to participate in the study) is added.
18. Page 6, the following sentence is omitted (In order to make each participant feel as comfortable as possible, they were requested to sit by themselves and respond to the questions)
19. Page 6, line 133 (verbal) changed to (written)
20. Page 6, the following sentence is omitted (The names of the school's workers’ were kept anonymous)
21. Page 6, line 134 (taken) changed to (obtained)
22. Page 8, line 166-167 (A sum variable) changed to (A sum score was constructed)
23. Page 8, line 16166, the sentence (Attitude of school workers towards their role in Toombak control, Cronbach’s α = 0.54) is added
24. Page 9, line 210 (multivariate) changed to (multiple variables). (Use) change to (using).
25. Page 11, line 211 (for the significant values in bivariate analysis) is deleted
26. Page 9 and 10, line 212-116 (was calculated for each multiple variable logistic regression model. Nagelkerkes R2 is a pseudo R square that generalize the coefficient of determination with values between 0and 1 where 0 denotes that the model for not explain anything about the variation in the dependent variable and 1 that the model completely explain the variance) is added
27. Page 11, line262-264 (A significantly smaller proportion of ever Toombak users reported positive attitudes than did non-users (88.1% versus 63.6%) is added
28. Page 11, line 264 (ever Toombak use was associated with negative attitude) is deleted.
29. Page 13, line 292 (knowledge) is added
30. Page 13, line 298 (of the variance) is added
31. Page 13, line 290 (in the multiple variable analysis) is added

32. Page 13, line 300-303. The sentence (The older group of school workers had almost five times greater likelihood to be Toombak users than their younger counterparts, OR 4.43 (CI 1.45-13.54, p<.001). Those with negative attitude had almost four times the likelihood to be Toombak users compared to those with positive attitudes OR 0.26 (CI 0.80-0.86, p<.05). is added

33. Page 14, line 306, (valuable) changed to (baseline)

34. Page 14, line 310, (the prevalence) is added

35. Page 14, line 339 (function as) is added

36. Page 14, line 279 (in that study) changed to (where)

37. Page 15, line 305 (to have) is added

38. Page 15, line 307 (while others) is added

39. Page 15, line 310-311 (no evidence to support the school tobacco policy), and (and those), (authors) were deleted

40. Page 15, line 314 (unaware) changed to (low awareness)

41. Page 16, line 319 (participation in) is added

42. Page 16, 322 (more females than males) is added

43. Page 16, line 323 (and with females more than males) is deleted

44. Page 16, line 382 (although reflect a realistic picture of the current situation) is added

45. Page 17, line 387-394. The conclusion is rewritten


47. Page 11, Table 1. Redesigned and numbers checked and changed

48. Page 13. Table 3. Redesigned to include totals

49. Page 22. Table 4. Redesigned to include all regression results as recommended by the reviewer.