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Reviewer's report:

The study uses an innovative idea to disseminate oral health education to migrant and underserved population.

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. 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.

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