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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript was improved after revision. However, there is a question that still needs revision.

Results

- Please revise the results (Table 3) and the description of the results. I believe that the letters for "knowledge of border molding" are incorrect (To revise: plaster model B, silicone A, mannequin A). For content of practical training, the mannequin showed better result while no difference was found for plaster model and silicone strategies' training. No difference was found between approaches' training for "personal learning attitude" subscale (to add the letters in the Table).

Authors: I am sorry that there must have been some confusion regarding the table. As explained in Table 3, the letters indicate significant differences between the groups indicated by the same letters. For example, there are significant differences in knowledge of border molding between plaster and silicone models (a and a) and between plaster models and mannequins (b and b). I hope that this is now clearer.

When there is statistical difference between groups, different letters must be used. Equal letters indicate absence of statistical significance differences. Please correct it!

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

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