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Editor, *BMC Oral Health*

**Re: A study of the provision of hospital based dental General Anaesthetic services for children in the North West of England: Part 2. The views and experience of families and dentists regarding service needs, treatment and prevention**

We are very grateful for the time and effort that the reviewers have made in helping us improve this work.

I am pleased to say that we have addressed the comments from the four reviewers. The main revisions involve the methodology including carrying out the interviews and details of the analysis used. The authors have also elaborated on the bias and limitations of the study as well as reflection on the researchers influence on respondents and analysis.

In response to reviewer 3 comments on including two different groups it is hoped the additional information on the methodology and interview schedules will have answered these queries. However the authors would like to note that articles in other high impact journals have shown the importance of considering joint perspectives from both service users and providers. Indeed, separating these two important perspectives reinforces the provider / patient divide when the direction of travel within health care is to bring these closer together. Only by considering these two perspectives together can readers understand the commonalities and differences between them.

We have detailed the changes and response in the following document and have uploaded the revised version of the manuscript.

I hope that this is satisfactory. Do please contact me if I can provide anything further.

Kindest Regards
Michaela Goodwin
Reviewer's report 1

Reviewer: Paul Averley

Minor Essential Revisions-
I believe the Title should be worked on to make it more accurate for this study and also linking it better to Part 2. I suggest something along the lines of "A qualitative study of the provision of hospital based dental general anaesthetic services for children in the North West of England- Part 1. A comparison of service delivery between six hospitals"

Author response: We have changed the title to


A suggestion for Part 2.-something along the lines of
"A qualitative study of the provision of hospital based dental general anaesthetic services for children in the North West of England- Part 2. The lived experiences of Children, their families, referring and treating dentists."

Author response: We have changed the title to

A study of the provision of hospital based dental General Anaesthetic services for children in the North West of England: Part 2. The views and experience of families and dentists regarding service needs, treatment and prevention

Discretionary Revisions-
In the Conclusions I would like to see some clearer recommendations being made to help steer improvements in commissioned service delivery for this group of children.

Author response, while part 1 of these two papers outlines the possible areas of improvement, part 2 elaborates on the recommendations for service delivery.

Reviewer's report 2

Title: An In-depth Exploration of the Differences between Delivery and Organisation
Reviewer: Richard Holmes

This qualitative paper is the second in a series of two. The paper is actually about the impact upon children, their families and referring GDPs of variation in the delivery and organisation of DGA across different hospitals in the north west of England. The current title of the paper is rather generic – detailing the general research approach rather than the actual aim (to understand the impact upon stakeholders of variation in DGA services...).

Minor Essential Revisions
1. ‘Background’. The current study title refers to an ‘in-depth exploration’ of the differences between delivery and organisation of DGA services. Would an in-depth exploration of ‘key stakeholders’ not include NHS commissioners and/or local hospital or department managers? Are these professionals not (as you state) ‘key stakeholders connected to the DGA service’ whose decisions would impact upon service-users (as described in the last line of the Background section). Perhaps need to say and justify this aspect or make clear your rationale (see comment #2 below).

Author response – Key staff as been changed to dental staff connected to the DGA service

2. Method. (Table 1). Here we find one ‘commissioner’ amongst the participating dentists, but there is no reference in the main text to involving a commissioner (just ‘dentists and consultants who ran the DGA sessions’ – Methods section, 1st paragraph). This needs some reference in the main text of the manuscript.

Author response – line 128-129 added section on commissioner involvement.

3. Method (1st paragraph). Who initially approached parents and children to determine willingness to participate? Was this the same person for all participants – (MG)?

4. Method (1st paragraph). Participants were recruited from 3 settings but in Table 1 there are 4 ‘Areas’ listed (one participant ID #648 came from Area ‘4’?).

Author updated

5. Results. Clarity re. sub-themes. In the introduction to the results (2nd paragraph of Results section). Need detail re. presence (or not) of sub-themes considered underneath the main 3 themes. The presentation of results is already divided into what, for some, may be considered sub-themes as outlined in Figure 1.

Author response – the key areas established in part 1 correspond with the sub-themes for part 2 – therefore they do cross over but the qualitative piece allows a more in depth exploration of these themes established.

6. Results. I think there are too many quotations simply listed in one group (n=6) without further commentary at the end of the ‘Role of hospital environment’ theme.

Author response – two quotes have been deleted and the section has been commented on further (line 400-401)

7. Results. ‘The influence of the wider social context on dental health’ theme does not match Figure 1 theme label. Need to explain use of a different or overarching term.

Author response – line 463 updated to include population and the influence of the wider social context to match Figure 1

8. Discussion. 3rd paragraph. “(discussed by Dentist 5 within the organisational and professional subtheme)”. This is the first time the use of the term ‘subtheme’ has been mentioned anywhere in the manuscript. We need further clarity on what exactly are themes and what are the subthemes.

Author response – updated to theme

secondary reference? There is no reference to Hubbock contained in the main reference list.

**Author response – error on citation updated now correct**

Discretionary Revisions

10. Method. What did the participants know about the interviewer (MG) and perhaps most importantly, did they know the investigator’s reason/s for doing this research study? (Would/could this have impacted upon consent rate?)

The author has updated the discussion section to detail the researcher and how this may have affected participant response.

11. Method. What were the actual data collection settings used by participants after they had been given the opportunity for choosing either: dental/home/telephone interviews? **Author updated**

12. Method. What was the duration of the interviews? **Author updated**

14. Method. (end of 2nd paragraph) Data saturation - who/how was this agreed by the research team? (e.g. did emerging themes require any modification?). There is no explicit statement (even in the ‘Authors Contributions’ section) as to who was involved in the analysis phase. **Author updated in both methods and author contributions**

15. Discussion. Was there any participant checking / feedback of the findings? Not for these themes therefore not included in this article

16. Discussion. (Limitations section). Perhaps in this specific section, more could be made of the fact that the study did not explore the views and experiences of children (as stated in the Abstract ‘- Background section) and that the study was actually about parents’ and dentists’ views. This is mentioned elsewhere by the authors but it is an important limitation when compared to the first paragraph of the Abstract. **Author updated in limitations**

Minor issues NOT for publication

17. ‘Background’ section – first line. Quote: ‘...referral for a general extraction’ requires rewording. **Author updated**

18. Figure 1. First theme, should this not be ‘Increase preventative measureS...’? 19. Figure 1. Words missing from 3rd theme title ‘Social context and....?’ **Author updated**

20. Figure 2. ‘Organizational vs. Organisational’. Used twice in this figure with different spellings. Suggest use UK spelling throughout. **Author updated**

21. Results. The first quotation used in ‘Results’ section. Label refers to ‘Hospital 1’ rather than the participant’s Area number. Is this correct? **Author updated**

22. Results. The second quotation used in ‘Results’ section is missing its ‘Area’ identifier number. **Author updated**

23. Results. The fifth quotation used in ‘Results’ section is missing its ‘Area’ identifier number. **Author updated**

24. Results. Paragraph beginning ‘Those working in the field were also aware of THE wait....’ add ‘the’. **Author updated**

25. Results. Quotation beginning ‘(talking about her dentist referring....’). Is there a word missing from ‘...He didn’t want them to be_?_ he said he...’. If not, this part of the quotation could be removed. **Author updated**

26. Results. ‘Prevention and previous treatment’ section. “...is the subject of another paper’. Should this work not be referenced (again)? **Author – this is a subheading within the theme – the same as reason for referral on the previous page**

27. Results. Check formatting of two quotations within the main body of the text (rather than on separate lines as elsewhere) in 2nd paragraph of ‘Prevention and previous treatment’ section. **Author updated**

28. Results. Quotation beginning ‘One of the things I try and say to the parents....’ requires editing re. ‘we get rid of them all of those...’ (?) **Author updated**

29. Results. ‘Child friendly environment’ section – first paragraph. Should the
quotation from a parent not be associated with a participant identifier? Author updated
31. Results. ‘The influence of the wider social context on dental health’ theme. First paragraph “As noted in Part 1 [1], differenceS between DGA....”. Author updated
32. Results. The influence of the wider social context on dental health’ theme. I don’t understand the identifiers for the final two-way conversation quotation in this theme ‘R’ ?, ‘I’(interviewer?), ‘R1’ ? Author updated
33. Discussion. Paragraph 5. Sentence beginning “However another important aspect is for some children.....” this sentence is too long and does not make sense in parts. Author updated
34. Conclusion. First sentence. “…discussed the effects” - on whom? 35. Conclusion – first paragraph. “…the North West OF England”. Author updated

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable. Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician. Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests.
Reviewer's report 4
Title: An In-depth Exploration of the Differences between Delivery and Organisation of Dental General Anaesthetic services and treatment in the Northwest England: Part 2. Qualitative analysis
Version: 1
Date: 10 December 2014

Reviewer: Rebecca Wassall
The writing is very clear and I enjoyed reading this article. I have made a few suggestions for possible corrections/amendments that the authors may wish to consider to further improve the clarity of the article:

Line 78 – include reference after ‘setting’ Author updated
Line 90 – what does [page 4,2] mean? Author page reference of for that quote
Line 165 to 166 – because a ‘variety of techniques…’ consider including what other techniques are used apart from constant comparison Author rewritten this section
Line 202 – change ‘respondents’ to ‘parents’
Line 209 – include ‘parent’ 802 Author updated
Line 212 – include ‘parent 806 Author updated
Lines 225 to 227 – is not clear to me what you mean Author rewritten – now line 252
Line 267 – remove ‘etc’ Author updated
Line 307 – include ‘parent’ 811 Author updated
Line 312 – the reasons behind it ‘appears to’ being…. Author left as this would not make sense
Line 439 – certainly ‘the’ presence… Author updated
Line 505 – R1 not R Author updated
Line 522 – where ‘the’ qualitative not needed
Line 550 – in ‘an attempt to’ avoid…. Author updated
Lines 554 to 556 - is not clear to me what you mean Author updated
Lines 586 to 587 – I agree but does this statement need a reference or explanation?
Lines 600 to 602 – this is a long sentence Author shortened
Line 614 – the ability ‘of XXX’ to aid… Author left as not applicable
Line 653 – reference needed Author updated

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.
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests
Reviewer's report 3
Title: An In-depth Exploration of the Differences between Delivery and Organisation of Dental General Anaesthetic services and treatment in the Northwest England: Part 2. Qualitative analysis
Reviewer: Tim T Newton

The aim of this research (from the abstract) is “to understand the impact of such variation (in patterns of service delivery and the organisation of Dental General Anaesthesia) by exploring views and experiences of children and their families receiving care in different hospital sites, as well as dentists involved in referral and delivery of care”. In order to achieve this interviews were conducted with 26 individuals comprising 15 patients, 6 dentists in primary care, and 5 dentists delivering DGA services.

Major Compulsory Revisions
Background
The Background section mainly focuses on the role of DGA in patient management in dentistry, and fails to provide any theoretical framework for understanding service delivery and organisation. While somewhat dated the authors might have considered adopting Maxwell's (1984) dimensions as a basis for addressing the scope of service delivery.

Authors have updated the background section to describe how the paper fits with Maxwell's dimensions line 100 to 109

Method
I have concerns about the adoption of a single analytical framework for two groups, which prima facie appear to have very different perspectives on the issue under address. I would need to have considerable more confidence in the method and analysis before I would accept that the two give qualitatively equivalent responses. I have argued elsewhere that patients might only be reasonably expected to comment on four of Maxwell's dimensions (Newton 2001).

Authors have gone into greater detail regarding the methodology and analysis the background now describes that only a set number of Maxwell's dimensions can be addressed within this type of research. The single analytical framework comment is addressed in greater detail in later comments.

While we are told that the original intention was to sample 'purposively' – we are not told to what purpose. If we assume it is to meet the aim, then we would assume that the sampling would be based on individuals who had experienced different types of service, or who had experience of contrasting services.

Author has updated to indicate how purposive sampling may have been used within the parent group

Similarly we might expect individuals involved in the design of service delivery and organisation to be interviewed. However I can’t see how these can be seen as a single group – surely they are answering from different perspectives? For example I fail to see how the same interview schedule can be given to patients, and dentists.

There is insufficient information presented on the method of analysis. There is one line which provides insufficient detail to replicate the analysis “analysis involved a variety of techniques including constant comparison to elicit common themes and look for unusual cases”.

Author update - the same interview schedule was not given to both, the questions posed to dentists have now been described in the text. The method and analysis section has been elaborated upon (line 207 -217). The point of taking into account views of what could be considered two or three different groups has now been discussed (line 552-558) however there are other examples from high impact journals which show the importance of considering
joint perspectives and how they vary along the same themes, such examples are [http://www.bmj.com/content/330/7500/1122.short](http://www.bmj.com/content/330/7500/1122.short) and [http://www.bmj.com/content/342/bmj.d142.long](http://www.bmj.com/content/342/bmj.d142.long). Therefore the authors consider the combination of groups within this article to be acceptable.

**Discussion and Conclusions**

The authors might wish to reflect on the possible bias introduced by their own role when conducting interviews, in line with good practice in qualitative research. Overall I think that this manuscript would benefit from use of the CASP guidance to guide the reporting of the conduct, analysis and discussion.

Authors have added to the limitations section describing the interviewer and also bias in response. The authors have also included the COREQ 32 item checklist within this letter and detailed how each item is met in the article by referring to the corresponding line number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Guide questions/description</th>
<th>Answered in study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Interviewer/facilitator</td>
<td>Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?</td>
<td>Line 761-762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Credentials</td>
<td>What were the researcher’s credentials? <em>E.g. PhD, MD</em></td>
<td>Line 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Occupation</td>
<td>What was their occupation at the time of the study?</td>
<td>Line 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gender</td>
<td>Was the researcher male or female?</td>
<td>Line 724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Experience and training</td>
<td>What experience or training did the researcher have?</td>
<td>Line 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship with participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Relationship established</td>
<td>Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?</td>
<td>Line 140-141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer</td>
<td>What did the participants know about the researcher? <em>E.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research</em></td>
<td>Line 724-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Interviewer characteristics</td>
<td>What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? <em>E.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic</em></td>
<td>Line 724-732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 2: study design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical framework</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Methodological orientation and Theory</td>
<td>What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? <em>E.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis</em></td>
<td>Line 183-194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Guide questions/description</td>
<td>Answered in study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sampling, how were participants selected? <em>e.g.</em> purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball</td>
<td>Line 150-154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Method of approach, how were participants approached? <em>e.g.</em> face-to-face, telephone, mail, email</td>
<td>Line 128 - 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sample size, how many participants were in the study?</td>
<td>Table 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Non-participation, how many people refused to participate or dropped out?</td>
<td>Line 702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Setting, setting of data collection, where was the data collected? <em>e.g.</em> home, clinic, workplace</td>
<td>Line 142-148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Presence of non-participants, was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?</td>
<td>Line 128-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Description of sample, what are the important characteristics of the sample? <em>e.g.</em> demographic data, date</td>
<td>Table 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Data collection, were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? was it pilot tested?</td>
<td>Line 172 - 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Repeat interviews, were repeat interviews carried out? if yes, how many?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Audio/visual recording, did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?</td>
<td>Line 181-182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Field notes, were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?</td>
<td>Line 181-182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Duration, what was the duration of the interviews or focus group?</td>
<td>Line 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Data saturation, was data saturation discussed?</td>
<td>Line 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Transcripts returned, were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domain 3: analysis and findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Number of data coders, how many data coders coded the data?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Description of the coding tree, did authors provide a description of the coding tree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.