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Reviewer’s report:

I was happy to read this manuscript of important topic and suitable to the journal. May be still my role is to make some comments.

Abstract

Please add when the data was collected here in the abstract and also later in the text.

Here you write that the objective is to assess the gaps…. May be is best to make clear research question here and later in the text.

Background

I was just wondering based on which literature search the text here is based on.

Methods

You may just write that the setting was one university in Northern Vietnam, the name of the university is not relevant issue here. Also we should consider the anonymity issues. When the data was collected? How the informed consent was achieved? Was paper format questionnaire used or not? In which kind of situation the students answered, was there some common time organized or how the data collection occurred? The randomization was done, but what happened after that in practice, how the data collection was organized?

The instrument used is not enough explained and so from this version is impossible, I regret to say, to comment the results. First the instrument section needs to be better written. Was there a knowledge test used or not? Explain first all knowledge questions, now you have first about knowledge, then attitudes and then back to knowledge.

Knowledge was measured and how, how many statements in each content area. In the analysis part you write that students that chose the correct answer was presented. This sentence leads to me think you had knowledge test, so each statement had a right answer. When looking your tables, I am not sure you have used the knowledge tests here.

Analysis

Please look, here some text that you should present before. Compare the title you have here, not all the text here is about analysis.
You write here about Cronb. alpha values, but if you have some knowledge test, to know or not to know, not any Cronb. alpha value is relevant to count here.

Results
Please, structure the results based on the research questions you want to answer. Before this clarify the instruments used. Now is hard to comment the results, because it is unclear whether some knowledge test were used or not, more information needed and also clear research questions.

Discussion
This should be structured based on research questions.

Conclusion
These should be based on own results, not some general conclusions.
Try to write something more concrete related to the shortcomings, second paragraph, what should be done. Which especially should be highlighted?

References
May be you could be more critical with the references, like number 18 is 15 years old, also number 16 almost 20 years old, number 24 etc. etc., newer information exists.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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