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Reviewer's report:

Comment: This is a cross-sectional survey in Nepal to investigate the impact of dental education on the oral health status and compare the dental professionals’ practice of preventive dentistry and oral self-care behaviors to that of the laypersons. The paper may have a value for researchers study in this field.

Abstract: The structured abstract can be revised to not more than 250 words.

For example:

1) “The aim of this study was to investigate the impact of dental education on ....” can be revised as “This study aimed to investigate the impact of dental education…”, and

2) “A total of 472 participants (195 dentists and 277 laypersons from the general population) were recruited to this cross-sectional study.” can be revised as “This cross-sectional study recruited 472 participants (195 dentists and 277 laypersons from the general population)

Introduction
The hypothesis tested can be rewritten as null hypothesis

Methods
It is not known if the questionnaire is validated.
It is not known how to calibrate if there is only one examiner.
The intra-examiner agreement should be reporte if available.

Results
Please report the actual p value, not p<0.05.
Any data about the education level between the 2 groups? This can be a factor affecting the outcome and should be discussed.

Discussion
The limitations of the study such as sampling method should be discussed.

Conclusions
The author may put down the dentists had a better periodontal status and less
caries prevalence than the laypersons examined.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes
3. Are the data sound? Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? No, but can be added in the revised manuscript.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes
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