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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions
This is a pertinent, important, well-conducted study and well-written manuscript. The study results summarize the opinions of NC dentists concerning physicians’ practices relative to the recommendations of the AAPD Guideline and AAP Policy current at the time of the data collection, 2010-2011. In the introduction, general recommendations from AAPD and AAP are mentioned. However, because of the time sensitive interpretations, a suggestion is to more clearly identify the key recommendations from the dated AAPD Guideline and AAP Policy that were vital to the conduct of this study. A suggestion is to use the date of the Guideline or Policy in the text and tables, e.g. AAP Policy (2008) and the specific recommendation. This dated information about the specific recommendation will help future readers of this study more readily understand the findings within the historical context. The discussion could include the most current AAPD Guideline and AAP Policy recommendations if that provides information about the trajectory for this topic of care coordination among pediatricians and dentists.

References – Reference #3 could only be found as either:

or

Discretionary Revisions
Discussion, paragraph 2 – The first sentence is a bit confusing. Do the stats follow the “Adequate workforce” scenario (51.9%, 40.2%, and 84%)? Adding “of 1 year” to the end of the first sentence “…both AAP and AAPD
recommendations of 1 year” would highlight the recommendations. Also, changing to use “toddler” instead of 18 month old child as used in the survey questions may be too general for a toddler is defined as between 1-3 years of age.

Table 2 – The sentence at the bottom of Table 2 is a bit confusing. There is a word and letter missing “…that there a statistically…” and relating to the “3-group of categorical case scenario,” respectively. Also it would be helpful to remind the reader about the “3-group” (the last sentence of M4).
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