**RESPONSES TO THE REVIEWERS COMMENTS: ARTICLE NO: 724-5511-1-5**

Thank you for the responses that I have received in relation to the submitted article. I have gone through the queries and tried to address them.

**Point one.** The reviewer suggested that the abstract be rearranged. The abstract has been arranged to facilitate the flow from purpose, problem, setting, methodology, findings and conclusion. The document has been language edited.

**Point two**: introduction lacks argumentation- the author tried to put more arguments in the introduction.

**Point three:** The problem statement should be clear; the problem statement was readjusted to be more specific.

**Point four:** the purpose not clear. The purpose of the study has been corrected see page 6 under problem statement the last three sentences.

**Point five:** Population and sampling not described in details,description of population and sampling improved see page 8 under population and sampling.

**Point six:** question asked not clear: question improved see page 9 third line of first paragraph.

**Point seven:** Ethical consideration not detailed, for detailed explanation see page 9 last paragraph.

**Point eight:** Trustworthiness not well explained, for detailed explanation see page 10 first paragraph

**Point nine:** lack of critical discussion of literature, more discussions added see page 11 paragraph 2 line4, page 11 paragraph 3 line 10 and page 12 paragraph 4 last three lines.

Thank you