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Reviewer’s report:

The paper reported very important public health issue in Tanzania. I think the paper is useful for readers in African countries. However, there are several points must be improved.

Major comment

Table 6: Odds ratio of "known by 1990s" on heard nylon teeth is 0.12; people living "known by 1990s" region have lower possibility of hearing nylon teeth (odds ratio is less than 1). This is inverse to Table 5 in which more people heard in this category. There are possibility of mistake of calculation or negative confounding (some variable causes reversion). Please check your analysis. And if applicable, please explain the reason of different association between table 5 and 6 in Discussion section.

Table 7. In the text, authors mentioned "On other hand, proportionately more residents in regions where nylon teeth was known before 1990 (p< 0.001),". However the percentage in table 7 is 29.8%. This is seemed to a mistake.

Table 8. Directions of the odds ratios are quite different to table 7. PLEASE RE-CHECK THE FIGURES OF ALL TABLES.

Minor comments

Abstract

1. "Being residents in regions where nylon teeth myth was known before 1990 and/or hospital worker were associated with having have heard of nylon teeth myth (OR=0.12 0.09-0.16, p<0.001;OR=2.87 1.93-4.26, p<0.001).": It is grammatically difficult to understand. In addition, odds ratios 0.12 and 2.87 is different direction. Please modify the sentence.

Background

2. Page3, line number 13 "[2016]": This should be revised. ("in 2016" or removed?) This is also applicable to Discussion section.

3. Page3, line number 25 "by Johnston and Riordan 2005": Manner of reference should be follow the guideline of BMC oral health.
4. Page 4, line number 50 "analyzed using SPSS version 16.": It is better to move this sentence to the end of the data analysis section.

Results

5. Page 5, line number 23. "Apparently, the number of 25 participants from traditional healers, teachers and health workers strata could not always be reached.": Is this means "From our sampling frame, 25 participants were not obtained from traditional healers, teachers and health workers strata"?

6. Table 1: Should be use capital letters; primary, secondary, hospital, non-hospital. This is also applicable to other tables.

7. Table 2: I think you do not have to show the shi-square scores. This is applicable to other tables.

8. Table 5: Font size should be unified.

9. Table 6: "p" should be "p-value"

10. Please describe strength and limitation of the study.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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