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Reviewer's report:

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).

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.

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’?).

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.

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.
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.

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.


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?)

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?

12. Method. What was the duration of the interviews?

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.

15. Discussion. Was there any participant checking / feedback of the findings?

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.

Minor issues NOT for publication

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

18. Figure 1. First theme, should this not be ‘Increase preventative measures’? 

19. Figure 1. Words missing from 3rd theme title ‘Social context and….’?

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

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

22. Results. The second quotation used in ‘Results’ section is missing its ‘Area’ identifier number.
23. Results. The fifth quotation used in ‘Results’ section is missing its ‘Area’ identifier number.

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

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.

26. Results. ‘Prevention and previous treatment’ section. “…is the subject of another paper’. Should this work not be referenced (again)?

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.

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…’ (?)

29. Results. ‘Child friendly environment’ section – first paragraph. Should the quotation from a parent not be associated with a participant identifier?


31. Results. ‘The influence of the wider social context on dental health’ theme. First paragraph “As noted in Part 1 [1], differenceS between DGA….”.

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’ ?

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.

34. Conclusion. First sentence. “…discussed the effects” - on whom?

35. Conclusion – first paragraph. “…the North West OF England”.
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