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Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors,

Thank you for your revision of the draft. This paper is much improved but still have several points which should be considered. Please check comments below.

Major comment

#1. In analysis of whether the myth is perceived best treatment or not, how did you treat participants who answered they did not heard about nylon teeth? Are they included into the analysis? They should not be included in the analysis shown in Table 8. To confirm that, please describe detail of inclusion/exclusion criteria related to dependent variable and show the sample size in each table title.

#2. Discussion: "Residents in the regions where nylon teeth myth was known before 1990, females, the educated and hospital workers were more likely to have heard of nylon teeth myth. This is largely explained by the fact that the myth was at its peak in the 1990s [9-12] which made everyone at that time aware of the myth and its related practices."

I could not understand why the peak in the 1990s explain the association between females, low educated and hospital workers were more likely to heard of nylon teeth myth.

Minor comments

#1. Abstract: the sentence "Data was entered in a computer and analyzed using SPSS version 16." could be shortened to "Data was analyzed using SPSS version 16."

#2. Levels of significance is generally P < 0.05, not p ≤ 0.05.

#3. Subjects and methods: "Age: 18 - 45 years=0" would be 17-45?

#4. Discussion; please add citation information of 2012 national census.

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

No
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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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