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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors

Thank you very much for your responses and the changes you have done to the main manuscript as a response to my previous comments. However, I feel that several of my comments still remain unsolved. For example, several parts in the introduction part are unnecessarily repeated. For example, the introduction starts with the statement that air pollution results in increasing mortality, it moves on to say that exposure to air pollution is high and thus it is a problem that needs to be addressed, and then it comes back to reporting number of deaths attributed to air pollution.

Also, in the previous review I suggested that authors should be more specific about the sample of participants and the way they were recruited. The authors very nicely reported the faculties of KUMS but they did not address my other comments which have to do with the sampling framework: how many clusters did they approach, how many participants were invited and how many agreed to take part? Why were student randomly selected from each school? Was that due to high numbers of students in each school? Out of the randomly selected participants, how many agreed to take part?

Even though the authors report in their response to the comment about grammatical errors responded that they have fully edited the manuscript. However, there are many sentences which are unclear. The authors may want to consider getting the whole manuscript proofread by an English speaking person.
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