Author’s response to reviews

Title: Attitude toward and awareness of medical-dental collaboration among medical and dental students in a university in Indonesia

Authors:

Diah Maharani (raniabdillah@gmail.com)
Stacia Ariella (staciariella@hotmail.com)
Intan Syafaaturrachma (intandetris95@gmail.com)
Indriasti Wardhany (indriastiindah@gmail.com)
Armasastra Bahar (armsbah@hotmail.com)
Shinan Zhang (snzhang2000@163.com)
Sherry Gao (sherry1204gao@gmail.com)
Chun Chu (chchu@hku.hk)
Anton Rahardjo (anton_r@ui.ac.id)

Version: 1 Date: 12 Jun 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Asim Abdulrahman Al-Ansari (Reviewer 1)

Line 86 you mentioned "all medical and dental students... were invited". Please enter the total number of students here.
Response: 1,432 was inserted (line 90-91).

Line 120 you mentioned "the collected data were entered in excel by authors”. Please indicate which author(s)
Response: SA and IDS were inserted (line 127).

Line 122 you mentioned "data were cleaned by another researcher". Please indicate who did it.
Response: DAM was inserted (line 128).

Lines 143-146: you combined the "average" and the "poor" in one group in one group because the number in the poor group is very small. I understand this but what I disagree with is that you designated this new group as "students without good attitude". I think this is unfair to the 142 students who had "average" attitude. I suggest you find a better name for this group.

Response: The term was revised into “students with a fair attitude” (line 154).

Arheiam Arheiam (Reviewer 2)

Introduction: The study rationale needs to be justified

Response: Introduction was elaborated further and several supporting references were added (line 77-81 & line 338-349).

Methods: How many waves of the questionnaire were sent out?

Response: A sentence was added to address the required information (line 96-98).

Data analysis: The description of variables and covariates is unclear- more details are required. The cut-off points for the attitude were not clear or justified. It may be better to leave at as score and use linear regression, instead of logistic regression

Response: The questions used in this study was validated in a previous study by Zhang, which were adapted from the questions used by Hendricson and Migliorati (line 101-102 & line 350-353). The assumption of using linear regression was not met, therefor logistic regression was employed.

Line 121- 'To avoid missing data, a web-based questionnaire was adopted', please explain this statement.

Response: The sentence was revised and a related reference was inserted to clarify the intended meaning (line 128-130 & line 354-357).
Line 125: the authors used dichotomous response to measure attitude. Such approach is known to decrease internal-reliability, and increase in type II error rates in 2-point response formats. It is better to use more than 4 responses scale to measure attitude. The author should justify why they used a dichotomous scale.

Response: This limitation and the justification were added in the discussion section (line 268-271 & line 392-393).

Line 126: The authors described attitude as poor and good. However, attitude should be described as negative or positive

Response: The terms were revised throughout the manuscript.

The first paragraph of discussion is just reiteration of the aim which was followed by a discussion of methodology choices. The authors should answer the research questions and leave the discussion of methodology and limitations to the end of the discussion.

Response: The paragraphs were re-ordered beginning by answering the research questions and ending with the discussion of methodology and limitations (line 254-275).

The conclusion statement that (Good attitude and awareness can establish an essential foundation for fostering collaboration between medicine and dentistry) is not based on current study findings.

Response: This statement was deleted.

Mohammed Ali Al-Wesabi, master (Reviewer 3):

Title: The title is not in accordance with the sampling technique since it cannot be "among the students in Indonesia" (convenience sampling technique). The suggested title; Attitudes and Awareness of Medical - Dental collaboration of among a sample of Dental and Medical students in Universitas Indonesia).

Response: The title was revised accordingly (line 1-2).
Methods: The sampling technique is a non-probability sampling so the result beyond this study cannot be generalized for the overall students in Indonesia.

Response: This was added in the discussion section (line 255-257).

Is there any reference for categorizing the age to two groups more and less than 21 years? Please justify this categorization.

Response: This study employed the categorization used by a previous published study by Zhang et al, considering the students’ age entering clinical stage.

The attitudes and believes are best measured using a scale measure like Likret's scale Or Semantic Deferential scale, the authors used (yes/no) measure which is a non-sensitive measure and cannot assess the attitudes accurately.

Response: The limitation was addressed in line 268-271.

Line 120: "by of the authors"; should be corrected.

Response: This was corrected.

Line 121; "To avoid missing data, web-based questionnaire was adopted" what do you mean by this sentence, clarify it please.

Response: The sentence was revised and a related reference was inserted to clarify the intended meaning (line 128-130 & line 257-259).

Line 125; "the scores of each question were summed" must be corrected to (the scores of all questions were summed as the total attitude scores).

Response: This was revised (line 134).

"Having a family physician" and "last dental visits"; these variables were included in the study as an independent variables; is there any justification for this? Since it seems to be no clear association between those variables and the outcome.
Response: This was address by adding the discussion section with further references (line 220-224 & line 374-378).

Results: Second paragraph is somewhat confusing for the readers; the second part is a repetition of the first part of the same paragraph. You should mention if you first speak about the results of the Chi squared test and then you confirmed the findings using regression analysis.

Response: This paragraph was revised as suggested (line 156).

P value sometimes reported as \( p = \ldots \) and other times reported as \( p > \) or \( p < \ldots \); Reporting P value must be uniform across the text and all the tables too.

Response: The manuscripts throughout was adjusted accordingly.

The percentage symbol (%) must be deleted from the cells of the tables 1,2,4 as it is mentioned in the top of the column.

Response: Deleted as suggested.

Discussion: Second paragraph is too long and contain some repetition of the methodology issues.

Response: This paragraph was shortened and as suggested by another reviewer, this paragraph was moved to the end of the discussion section

First sentence of the third paragraph is also a repetition of the methodology.

Response: This sentence was deleted.

Lines 202-204 should be removed and added to the recommendations.

Response: This sentence was moved to the conclusion section (line 280-282).

"last dental visits" and "having a family physician" variables are not discussed in the discussion part at all

Response: The discussion was added accordingly (line 220-224).