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Reviewer's report:

General comment: Overall the premise of this study is based on the old and outdated principles of health education which are shown to be ineffective in changing behaviour. The manuscript is poorly structured. The paper adds no new knowledge. In short, this paper is conceptually weak and poorly written. English language revision is highly required.

Specific comment:
- Poor and unclear title: Comparison of oral health care??[KNOWLEDGE, BEHAVIOUR??] between….
- There is a huge potential to improvise the abstract for clarity. Needs a complete rewrite.
- The background is conceptually weak. It provides very little evidence to make a strong case for the purpose of the study and also lacks clarity in organisation.
- The methodology adopted in this paper is unclear and not informed by scientific evidence. The data collection methods and the analysis lack robustness.
- Results are not trustworthy and are superficial.
- Finally, the discussion fails to make a strong argument, there is lack of discussion of literature (in support/ against) and is unorganised. Several claims such as using a toothpick or herbal toothpaste improves oral health is flawed and not well supported by evidence. Often the authors use outdated references (>10 years old) to support their study findings. The paper lacks critical sections of research and policy implications and strengths of the study. Conclusions currently seem vague.

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.

No

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

No

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:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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