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The subject is valuable and might be suitable for publication after some retouches considering the following points;

1-Abstract:
- The objective is not specific and confusing with the stated background
- Presentation of numeric values is not informative, you can't say a total and then put percentage, this in addition to how did you get the percentage 141/?(62.9%)????
- Conclusion in the abstract is too long? Conclusion should be concise strict to the significant values of you results

2-Introduction
- The most important backbone in the context of the association between toombak use and health is its potentiality in causing oral cancer, The authors didn't return to the latest publications done in this context. You need to replace some of your literature in the introduction with some of these facts
- Justification at the end of the introduction is missed which is important to show the magnitude of the prior hypothesis
- Objectives are not clear
2- Materials and Methods:
- First go back to the journal instruction to see the section is it methods or materials and Methods????
- Secondly you need to describe the stratified random sampling procedure, and how did you determined the sample size????
- Instead of placing the whole questionnaire in the methodology, you would better summarize the most important variables, then you can submit it as supplementary materials.
- In statistical analysis; what you mentioned is confidence levels which determine the level of your test of significant acceptability. Confidence interval is referral to sample representatively, please calculate it and place it with sample size.
- Ethical consent: where is the participant consent???

3- Results:
- First word results and not result
- The presentation of the results is very poor it requires an extensive reconstruction
- Almost all of the significant values can't be confirmed due to way of the results presentations
- Numbers should be arranged clearly in Tables including significant tests
- Authors should gather together small Tables in one
- As the present study represent a descriptive survey!!! Presence of descriptive Figures is important, to facilitate for reader

4- Discussion:
- Discussion section needs to be stronger, by:
  - Removal of repetition of results and clearly presentation of points such as,
  - Review of primary outcome measures, secondary outcome measures, results as they relate to a prior hypothesis.
  - Interpretation and implications in the context of the entirety of evidence.
- Controversies raised by this study; and Future research directions.

5- References
References numbers 1,12,38
- Some minor language mistakes
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