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Author’s response to reviews:
I. When checking percentages reported, for instance in the abstract, it is obvious that there appear to be inconsistencies. Suppose they are caused by a varying number of missing on the different items. It is particularly obvious when 11 daily users of Toombak constitute 64.7% of the 22 ever users. Perhaps the authors could take a look at this and perhaps add a sentence which explains this problem.

Reply:
As shown from the table imported from SPSS from the 22 ever users only 17 replied to whether they are daily or occasional users, and as we use the valid percent to deal with missing, therefore, 11 out of 17 constitute 64.7%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>occasional user</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daily user</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. All alpha values reported are quite low. This deserves to be mentioned as a limitation of the Study. Could it be that alpha underestimates the true reliability of the scales? Some elaboration on this would improve the quality of the manuscript.

Reply:
Page 17, lines (382-384), this sentence was added in the limitation of the study section
“ The Alpha values (Cronbach’s α) reported in this study were lower than the expected rule of thumb (0.7), this may affect the reliability of some questions, although some factors may affect the test as the number of items, the type of variables”.

3. In tables 1 and 2, line number is included as contents of the tables. Must be corrected.

Reply:
corrected

4. There is no reference to Fig. 1 in the text.

Reply:
Page 12, line 264 reference to figure 1 is added

5. The y-axis in Fig 1 is a percentage scale. When it comes to knowledge, I suppose it means % correct answers. But for the attitude scale, I am not sure what it means. There may be a need to explain to the readers what the percentages mean.

Reply:
The Y represents percentage the of the participants that reported positive attitude among Toombak users and non-users and good knowledge of health hazards. They are categorical variables dichotomized poor and good knowledge, negative and positive attitudes and this represents the percentage of those reported good and positive

Changes to the submitted manuscript
1. Page12, line 264. (p<0.001) is omitted and the word (Figure 1) is added.
2. Page 17, lines (382-384), this sentence was added in the limitation of the study section
“ The Alpha values (Cronbach’s α) reported in this study were lower than the expected rule of thumb (0.7), this may affect the reliability of some questions, although some factors may affect the test as the number of items, the type of variables”.
3. Anew reference is added in page 17, line 385.
3. Page 18, lines 405-6, the following sentence is added (Khartoum State, Sudan).
4. Page 18, line 407, the following sentence (Written informed consent) is added.
5. Page 17, lines 384, Reference (46) is added