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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

The present study has valuable finding with a new scientific method through cooperation of African countries representatives to collect data. It is very useful for studies with an international scope, however, data collection does not show a clear and specific method and procedure of sampling and therefore it is highly scattered. That is, 90% of the responses are from only for countries which bear a serious doubt of its possible generalization to other countries. It seems that this issue needs attentive care and perhaps should be addressed effectively. Following comments of review is available right here below and other points worth noting is organized in a table below.

- Sentence Structure
- Scientific writing
- Native speech editing

Reviewer points of view

All article sections:

1. Sentence Structure

2. Scientific writing

3. Native speech editing
title:

1. Since cross sectional studies are routine research it is not essential to mention it in the title. Year of research could be included though.

2. The title needs to be altered. The word foundation seems irrelevant.

Abstract:

1. It has to be meticulously changed according to the changes in the article body

2. Method section needs more elaboration. Topics like time, place, study population, sample size, sampling method, type of the analyses should be mentioned concisely.

3. In finding section, the results should be mentioned in summery.

4. Conclusion section needs to be written according to what is brought in the article body.

5. Keywords are critical and they are absent in the abstract. Authors must include a number of keywords, preferably checked with MESH.

Introduction:

1. About elaboration on the necessity of this study benefits and complications should be mentioned

2. Noting the fact that it has been previously conducted in other countries, it is worth mentioning their findings as well.

3. To mention the study aim at the end of the introduction, only the main aim as a sole one should be mentioned clearly in one sentence.
Method:

1. Study design and method should be explained in a step by step manner and analyses of the findings should be together with the aim of applying that analyses in complete.

2. Organization of country responsible for the study should be mentioned. Its initiation, supports and acknowledgments.

3. In data collection section the following points need to be included; time period which data was collected, method of follow ups on gathering the data, criterion which the data collection was finalized, data quality control, sample size in each country based on the sample size criterion, inclusion and exclusion of participants' questionnaires. Ethical considerations should be included as well.

4. In the analysis part please address the internal validity of the collected data.

5. All statistical methods which was applied should be mentioned together with their specific objectives. For example, tests applied for homogeneity of the data should be included and the reason for applying should be mentioned in the methods part.

findings:

1. Likewise to the methods section it has to be written crystal clear.

2. Findings are not expressed and explained properly.

3. Consecutive order of the tables should be considered.

4. All applied statistics tests and their application reason should be moved and explained in the methods section. (currently findings and methods are mixed)

5. Purpose of analyses for inter-country variability tests should be explained clearly and it should be mentioned in methods section.
6. Findings are not coherent and their relationship with methods seems unclear and independent.

7. Demographic characteristics of the participants is no included.

8. Figure captions should be written below them.

Discussion:

1. Noting excellent interpretation of the author, it is suggested that more relevant international studies should be included and compared.

2. There is no need to refer to tables in the discussion part.

3. Suggestions should be included in the findings section based on each presented result.
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