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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review the manuscript titled "German dentists' websites on periodontitis have low quality of information". The paper describes an assessment of the quality of a random sample of German dentists' websites on periodontitis. The topic is certainly relevant given the increasing importance of the internet as a source of health-related information for the public. That said, it is also not very original: there is a large number of similar publications assessing the quality of websites on different topics all using similar approaches. Interestingly the authors did not limit their quality evaluation to general aspects but also included some context-specific measures of quality, greatly improving the applicability of their results.

Overall the paper is clear: the rationale for the study is sound, the methods are well described, and the discussion nicely interprets the results in light of relevant literature. The writing, however, needs some polishing, preferably by a native speaker.

My only major comment is about the sample size. The authors acknowledge that some differences might have been hard to detect because of limited power. As the analysed websites are part of a larger pool, I am left wondering why the authors did not add more websites to the sample in order to overcome this limitation. I would therefore advise to re-do the analyses using a bigger sample. This would greatly improve the generalisability - and therefore the impact - of the results.

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.
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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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
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