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Reviewer's report:

Title:

The title is not in accordance with the sampling technique since the 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)

Methods:

The sampling technique is a non-probability sampling so the result beyond this study cannot be generalized for the overall students in Indonesia.

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

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.

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

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

Line125; " the scores of each question were summed" must be corrected to ( the scores of all questions were summed as the total attitude scores).

"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.
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.

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.

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.

Discussion:

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

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

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

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

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.

Yes

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.
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