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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Background: Authors should re-write the aim of the study. At present, the aim emphasizes the workplace of a dental assistant as the major aspect taken into consideration for the analysis. The main focus of the manuscript is rather on other variables like the educational level.

2. Methods: Authors should clarify the method of selection of participants for the survey. Was it random?

3. Results: Authors declared that 498 questionnaires with compete data were returned, however, in Table 1, the total sum of respondents according to ‘age (years old)’ is 472 and according to ‘years of experience’ is 488. The same problem occurs in Tables 2 and 3 – in case of some questions the number of respondents is lower than 498. Similar problem concerns data in fourth paragraph of the Results section. It should be explained by authors. How did authors calculate the overall knowledge score in case of the lack of data?

Discretionary Revisions

Minor issues not for publication
1. Authors should revise the manuscript with regard to style. There are many repetitions, e.g. in the first two sentences of the Background section the word ‘injury’ was used five times. I suggest using synonyms like ‘trauma’ or ‘avulsion’. The third sentence in the second paragraph of the Background should also be rewritten to avoid unfortunate repetitions of the word ‘guidelines’. The same applies to the Results section – authors may use such words as participants, subjects or evaluated dental assistants interchangeably with respondents.

2. In my opinion, authors should avoid referring to the appendix in the Discussion section.

3. In the sentence where they refer to the papers of Baginska and Wilczynska-Borawska the correct name of profession is ‘school nurses’, and not ‘school dental nurses’.

4. The first sentence of the next-to-last paragraph of the Discussion section is too long and should be rewritten or divided into two sentences.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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