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Reviewer’s report:

The topic of this study is very intriguing and clearly has the potential to make important contributions in terms of policy recommendations. Overall, the manuscript is well-crafted and authors have thoroughly analysed the relevant components of the paper. This paper is, therefore, acceptable for publication after minor revisions.

1. In the first section, it is mentioned that 'a number of studies have highlighted the potential for suboptimal outcomes in the NHS orthodontic service in England and Wales'. This is a generalised overview and gaps in knowledge or what those studies specifically suggest is not clear from this statement. As the first objective of interest is to identify potential areas of efficiency improvement in NHS orthodontic service, it would be interesting to know about the conclusions drawn from other related studies as well.

2. It is highly recommended to provide details of external or internal validation and accuracy of clinician-reported information on treatment outcomes/identification methods (Page 6, line 5). If there is incompleteness or inaccuracy, it should be reported and discussed.

3. Consider citing references for the definitions provided in the methodology section, especially with regard to discontinuation and residual need.
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Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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