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Reviewer's report:

Re: 'Effectiveness of a quality management program in dental care practices'
Katja Goetz, Stephen M Campbell, Bjoern Broge, Marc Brodowski, Michel Wensing and Joachim Szecsenyi BMC Oral Health Research article

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
I consider the question to be well defined and relevant for the journal and the profession.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
There is a lack of clarity regarding several issues. The description of this study as a before and after with a comparison is confusing and this is not helped by reference to change scores which were not conducted for the comparison group. This occurs in table 2 with T1 described as reassessment and in the relevant text of the results.

3. Are the data sound?
The reporting of the data could be clearer. For example in table 2 the title states mean scores however percentages are reported it is therefore confusing what test has been applied. The issue of multiple tests is not accounted for.

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

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
yes however reference to the difference in first assessment/baseline data for intervention and comparison could be referred to in the text. The data suggest differences were present at the start for key domains.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   yes however suggest standardising text eg both comparison and control group are used throughout the paper

Minor Essential Revisions 2,3,6,9

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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