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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written paper addressing an important and little researched area within oral health. The study is generally well designed and reported but there are a number of small areas to improve.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   The current understanding in the area is clearly and concisely explained leading logically to a well defined question

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   In general the methods are appropriate for the aim. However
   a) (major essential) there is little discussion of how reflexivity of the researchers was considered and any subsequent issues addressed especially in the analysis
   b) (discretionary) there could be more detail describing the context of the study in terms of the types of institutions selected and to a lesser extent the status of the individuals interviewed
   c) (major essential) In page 5 2nd paragraph you note that one of the data sources you triangulated was opinions of care managers. However, there is no description in the method of how these data were collected or what specifically was collected.
   d) (minor essential) the description of the analysis is limited and basic. This should be expanded with further details of the development/identification of themes. This sections hould also read more logically (i.e. coding, validation of coding, constant comparision, identification of themes, discussion and refining of themes)

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes, the data are sound and comprehnsively presented.
   a) (discretionary) I would prefer to see the quotes interspersed throughout the results rather than in one table separately

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
In general the discussion and conclusion are well developed, comprehensive and the relationship to other theory is well explained.

a) (minor essential) The conclusion section is long and more of the conclusion section could be incorporated into the discussion

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
The limitations section is brief and contains generic discussion (in the 2nd paragraph) rather than limitations.

a) (major essential) The limitations should be discussed in more depth. This may be an area to explore reflexivity
b) (minor essential) Some of the current limitations section should be moved into the generic discussion

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
N/A

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes. I have noted a few corrections below (all minor essential)
a) Page 4 2nd line “purposively” rather than “purposefully”?  
b) Page 4 2nd paragraph – one system defined and noted to be acronym CIZ then acronym ZZP used without definition  
c) Page 5 2nd paragraph 1st line – extra “used” not needed  
d) Page 5 2nd paragraph “We carried out member checks…” doesn’t make sense  
e) Page 8 paragraph 1 Use of the word “handicapping” now out of date  
f) Page 9 3rd paragraph “left in the dark” colloquial phrase  
g) Page 9 3rd paragraph “tales” colloquial – consider “accounts” instead  
h) Page 10 paragraph 2 Use of the word “handicaps” now out of date

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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