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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Authors revealed the first-year dental students prefer to use Google and may associate lack of information literacy skills. And also report the efficacy of one-hour educational intervention to find evidence-based citations.

This revised manuscript responded reviewers’ comments, but still need to improve the structure of writing. Authors should mention clearly what was done in the previous research and indicate what would be clarified based on the previous finding in the background. However authors describe published data at the first paragraph of the results in this manuscript. Whole research design and methods of analysis should be explained in the methods, but educational intervention was first described in the result even though authors conclude the effectiveness and importance of educational intervention in the conclusion.

The discussion of Google have to be careful because there are many factors influence the data, and authors should not ignore other significant relationship data indicated.

This manuscript still have unnecessary long and repetitive description about assignment and ethical response, but lacked the precise information of research design.

Specific comments

Methods

Whole research design including groups of comparison, methods to evaluate the relation among groups, educational intervention should be clearly mentioned in the methods. For example, research design and method to make data of table 3 should be described in the methods.

Results

Authors should clarify the subjects of previous study (ref. 1) and current subject group C1 and C2. Published data (ref. 1) should be moved from the result section to the background.

Expression of race as ‘white’ and ‘others’ is not adequate.

Discussion
Authors concluded that there was association between the use of Google and incorrect response of technology dependent assignment. But it is hard to conclude any association because there was no direct evidence that students used Google to do assignments. Also, Cohort 1 and 2 showed different tendency about Google preference, and it seems that Google preference was not significantly different between incorrect and correct respondents of C2. Authors did not mention anything about PubMed preference, but data seems indicate that more stronger association between PubMed preference and correct respondents.

Figure legends
If data shown by graphs, data should not explained in the figure legends.

Table 1 should be shortened.
Table 3 Indicate which part of data used to elucidate data in this table.

Minor Essential Revision
Line 217 41.3 instead 42.5?
Line 165 Cronbach alpha was used. Where is the data?
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