



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_45602
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF WATER-PIPE SMOKING AND ITS ASSOCIATED FACTORS AMONG ARAB STUDENTS IN MALAYSIA
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	The objectives are not well stated and not correlated with the results. I suggest revising the whole manuscript. Lots of English mistakes. Consider having the manuscript edited by a native English speaker. in the introduction, the authors did not mention Lebanon despite having the highest prevalence of waterpipe smoking (37%). I suggest doing that and cite some articles from authors Pascale Salameh and Souheil Hallit who have recent findings about the topic. Consider shortening the introduction without having as many subsections. Consider dividing the methods section as such: study design, ethical aspect, minimal sample size calculation, questionnaire description, statistical analysis. why only use 3 questions for knowledge, attitude and practice? were these questions validated previously? Can the authors add some references from where they got these questions? Any cronbach alpha for these scales to assess reliability and internal consistency? Always state the direction of the results interpretation. For example, the authors state "Age was found to be significantly associated"..... age was associated with which variable? was it younger or older age? All results should be interpreted again. Table 5 descres some results that were not stated in the objectives. Consider revising. I suggest re-run the analysis based on 2 recommendations: 1) create a knowledge score and see which variables are associated with that score. 2) divide the sample into waterpipe smokers vs non-smokers and see the differences concerning all variables. I think it is better than having a pure descriptive article. Adjust the discussion section according to the new results in case the authors took my suggestions into consideration.	The manuscript has been attended to quite extensively, and the Objectives have been paid attention to. One of the co-authors' first language is English the past 50 years, and the manuscript has been edited for language also here appropriately. The authors do discuss the prevalence in Lebanon under Introduction which the respected Reviewer may have missed, although here we do not mention Lebanon in the manner Salameh and Hallit discuss. We have added relevant Studies by these two researchers. Highlighted. The Introduction has been re-written without the sub-topic headings. Appropriately highlighted. This Comment of the respected Reviewer has been attended to, ambiguity removed and appropriately highlighted. Attended to and highlighted. Objectives have been revised in light with the Reviewer's Comment. Highlighted. 1) Has been attended to and highlighted. 2) This would not be possible without the Lead Author redoing the Thesis, and we respectfully request the Reviewer to accept the Article in its present revised form. Discussions have been revised and highlighted.
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	