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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer 1

REVIEWER: One minor comment: On page 4 line 47 you include a footnote. This should be included as a reference in the bibliography.

RESPONSE: We have moved this footnote to the bibliography

Reviewer 2

REVIEWER: The introduction is well written, however, I am not convinced by the statement in the 3rd paragraph on page 3: Oral health education usually does not lead to behavior and practice change and even if it does, the long term sustainability if poor.

RESPONSE: We relied on a review article in making those statements, and on looking more closely at the article we agree that the evidence for behavior and practice change was more limited than we stated. Since our study focuses only on knowledge change, we have taken out the references to practice and behavior change (page 3, paragraph 3).

REVIEWER: Also, the last statement is incorrect about not finding published evaluations for OHE in migrant populations. It does not seem that the authors have conducted a systematic
review to review the literature and that is not the goal of this paper. Thus making such statements is inappropriate.

RESPONSE: We did conduct a literature search using a variety of search terms, but it was not a systematic review by any conventional standard. We have taken out mentions of the absence of existing studies.

REVIEWER: The results and discussion section had a lot of overlap. the discussion section includes several parts of what should have been presented in the results sections. When describing qualitative work, it is important to make a distinction what is presented in the results and discussion. themes that emerge from data are to be discussed in the results and the overall message that the study provides comes under the discussion section. Presently, the discussion section is providing some results. I suggest the authors rewrite the results and discussion sections.

RESPONSE: We agree, and have moved the lessons learned to the results section (pages 9-10) and limited the discussion to a high-level overview of the findings.

REVIEWER: In addition, several statements made in the discussion section require references.

RESPONSE: Those statements were removed in the re-writing of the results and discussion sections