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Reviewer's report:

Thanks for sending such an important manuscript to BMC Pediatrics. Oral-system connections are increasingly important and without dentists and primary care providers interacting we cannot assure to serve our patients well.

Major comments:

Can you make it clear in the manuscript what you learned from employing 3 regression models that you could not have learned without such elaborate approaches?

I believe your finding that primary care providers find "traditional elements of primary care information (e.g., tracking immunizations)" more important than oral health information not very surprising. I am sure similar findings would emerge in every speciality no matter what. It would have been interesting to compare the level of importance of two "unrelated" (everything is related in health, so in quotation marks here) areas in the eyes of primary care providers. Obviously, you cannot change that anymore…just food for thoughts.

Minor comments

"For a modest EHR development cost, " - After being involved for 20+ years in software development, I can judge that there are no "modest" development costs no matter how small the development. Please provide an exact number or remove the unsupported qualifier.

"This study has a few limitations" is superfluous under a headline "L:imitations" - one would hope you would not add a section like that if there were no limitations. Suggest to remove.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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