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Reviewer's report:

This is a well-performed study on the quality of health information of German dental practices. Sample size is large enough to allow proper statistical analysis. Scoring was done by one individual but inter-rater reliability was studied in advance.

I only have minor comments.

1) a statistical tool online was used rather than conventional, well-known stat software. Although this seems from a reputable academic I would trust it. However, I would like to know whether the test used does correct for multiple comparisons (such as the Bonferroni correction or similar)

2) line 159-160. Authors' questions were developed building on quality guidelines from Switzerland. Unfortunately the paper (9) cited is in German, which makes it difficult for most readers to read. Would it be possible to summarize in a paragraph what those quality guidelines are, who developed them (academy, no-profit organizations etc.) and to what type of studies these criteria have been applied to?

3) The authors cite ref no. 8 for a similar study in English and find contrasting data. However, that study only looked at very basic criteria of information quality, like most studies of this kind, the JAMA score. It would be important to discuss that the JAMA score does not assess content for correctness. In this respect the study under review here goes more in depth. The authors should also explain why they decided not to look at the (very easy) JAMA criteria. While those are clearly superficial, the choice of not doing so makes it impossible to relate the results from this study to most of the existing literature on health information quality. To be clear, I think the authors here have done a much better study; only I expect a discussion about this, otherwise it is difficult to make comparisons.

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.

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.
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