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Author's response to reviews: see over
Editor’s Comments:

Please make the minor amendments and revisions requested by the reviewers. Please review the document for clarity and grammatical errors

Amendments were made in response to the reviewers’ comments. Additionally, the manuscript was edited, for language and grammatical errors, by a native English-speaker and a professional in the field of public health. The changes made are highlighted in red

Reviewers’ Comments:

Referee 1

We thank the reviewer for his comments. Enclosed is our response to his critique:

Needs some language corrections before being published

A native-English speaker and an expert in the field of public health edited the manuscript for language and grammatical errors. The changes made are highlighted in red

Referee 2

We thank the reviewer for his feedback and comments. Enclosed is our response to his critique:

1. The conclusion should be separate section after discussion section

As requested by the reviewer, the conclusion was inserted as a separate section in the manuscript

2. The second statement in conclusion should be rephrased because it is not English

As suggested by the reviewer, the second statement in the conclusion was rephrased and is now clear

3. Abbreviations should not be used in conclusion as TM

As advised by the reviewer, we replaced the abbreviation TM with traditional medicine
4. References in the text were written in new way for example: (1,2,3,4) and it should be in this way (1-4), (9, 10, 11) should be (9-11) and many

References cited in the text were modified as per the reviewer’s request

5. Pages of references should be written in same manner, they sometimes write: 21-5 in first one, then: 339-45 in second ref, 4081-6 in third ref. and so on

Pages of references were amended as per the reviewer’s request

Referee 3

We thank the reviewer for her remark. Enclosed is our response to her critique:

Needs some language corrections before being published

A native-English speaker and an expert in the field of public health edited the manuscript for language and grammatical errors. The changes made are highlighted in red