

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Remuneration of primary dental care in England: A qualitative framework analysis of perspectives of a new service delivery model incorporating incentives for improved access, quality and health outcomes
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Robinson, Peter; Douglas, Gail; Gibson, Barry; Godson, Jenny; Vinall-Collier, Karen; Pavitt, Sue; Hulme, Claire

### VERSION 1 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Heiko Spallek University of Sydney School of Dentistry
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	16-Jun-2019

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>Thanks for submitting your research to BMJ Open!</p> <p>Major Concern: While your topic is important and your approach is good, I am concerned about the low number of people from whom you have collected data. I guess there is nothing you can do about it now.</p> <p>At the minimum, you need to discuss this limitation in stronger terms.</p> <p>Minor: Maybe consider having a native speaker reviewing your manuscript to weed out the random use of apostrophes, like in "Dentists' had responded" or in "while interviews with patients took place in patient's homes."</p>
-------------------------	---

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Ha Hoang University of Tasmania, Australia
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	21-Jun-2019

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. The paper was to explore stakeholder perspectives of the new service delivery model which promoted evidence-based preventive interventions, widened access to dentistry and encouraged the use of skill mix. The study used the Andersen Behavioural model of access as the theoretical framework for the qualitative analysis, which was appropriate. Overall the paper is nicely written and clearly communicated the findings. I have had some minor suggestions as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- For international audience, it would be good to spell out 'NHS' when you first mentioned it in the paper.</li></ul>
-------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The reader would also benefit from a definition of skill mix in the paper.</li> <li>- Page 2, line 20: Should the sentence read as: "Dentists responded to the contract..." instead of "Dentists' responded to the contract"?</li> <li>- Page 9, line 44, should the sentence read as: "Dentists had responded to the contract" instead of "Dentists' had responded to the contract"?</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Richard D Holmes Senior Lecturer / Hon. Consultant in Dental Public Health, School of Dental Sciences, Newcastle University, U.K.
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	15-Jul-2019

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>This is an interesting paper focused upon research in the ongoing modernisation of NHS dental health services in England. The paper seeks to explore stakeholder perspectives of the INCENTIVE service delivery model and in doing so, it appropriately adopted a qualitative approach using interviews, focus groups and the direct observation of a large number of dental appointments. Over thirty relevant stakeholders participated and these included 'lay people' (sensibly involving 'patients' and 'non-patients', n=18), dental professionals (n=15) and an NHS England commissioner.</p> <p>I enjoyed reading the paper and I have a few comments for the authors' consideration. These are minor issues which may collectively act to enhance or clarify specific aspects of the paper and the research undertaken.</p> <p>1]. 'Strengths and Limitations' box - suggest using a final (5th) bullet point to acknowledge the selection process for the dental practices involved and the potential for risk of bias / generalisability / reliance upon perceptions. Overall, the bullet points here could perhaps relate more to the specific research methods employed?</p> <p>2]. Methods - In the main manuscript there is no specific reference to external ethical review / reference number however, this may have been provided separately. I also note the link to the BMJ Open 'Protocol' paper but this submission may need to stand alone re. approvals. (Good to see evidence of the consent process / information sheets / consent forms detailed within this manuscript).</p> <p>3]. Methods - Page 4 of 25, 2nd paragraph of section (lines 55-56), reference is made to a stakeholder group comprising of: "...service commissioners" (plural) yet the Abstract suggests just one commissioner was involved.</p> <p>4]. Methods - Page 4 of 25, 2nd paragraph (lines 50-51) - I'd have been interested to read just a little more about the sampling matrix used re. purposive sampling and how participants' experiences were categorised.</p> <p>5]. Methods - Page 5 of 25, 1st paragraph (lines 8-10), who was the 'non-participant observer', what was their background and did they observe all 30 patient encounters? (re. Reflexivity - I am unable to see an uploaded qualitative reporting guideline e.g. COREQ, but this may have been provided to BMJ Open separately).</p> <p>6]. Methods - page 5 of 25, bottom paragraph line 56 - could delete brackets and "e.g.".</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>7]. Methods - page 6 of 25 'Patient and Public Involvement' section - good to see PPI being embraced throughout. The first line needs rewording (delete "and" after "research cycle"?).</p> <p>8]. Results - Page 7 of 25, lines 52-53 - reference to "traffic light system" is the first time the RAG is described this way. Although it is fairly obvious (and is visually depicted in the published BMJ Open Protocol paper), suggest additionally inserting "RAG" here for clarity.</p> <p>9]. Discussion - Page 11 of 25, lines 40-41 - list of citations after text: ".....most widely cited models of access to health care 23,24,37,28". Should the last citation here be "38" instead of "28", or does the citation sequence need re-ordering?</p> <p>10]. Discussion - What about moving forward from this study and, to take one specific example, the challenge of skill mix (identified in the paper as a challenge for dentists)? Could passing reference be made to ongoing work / policy re. "Advancing Dental Care" from Health Education England or perhaps the recent report entitled "The Future Oral &amp; Dental Workforce for England" (7th March 2019) also available via HEE website and led by Professor Jenny Gallagher? Whilst INCENTIVE does not focus upon the training of dental professionals, this issue would link to statements made in the paper's conclusion re. payments "rewarding the contribution of the dental team" and in the Abstract conclusion section re. dentists facing challenges in the "deployment of skill mix" etc.</p> <p>11]. Conclusion - Page 12 of 25, lines 12-13 - The Steele Report was published in June 2009.</p> <p>12]. References List - Reference #37 (Baker, SR) is a duplicate of Reference #26. Minor formatting errors Refs: #13, #19, #31, #32</p>
--	---

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer comment	Author response
Please revise your title so that it includes your study design. This is the preferred format for the journal	Revised to: Remuneration of primary dental care in England: A qualitative framework analysis of perspectives of a new service delivery model incorporating incentives for improved access, quality and health outcomes
Please revise the 'Strengths and limitations' section of your manuscript (after the abstract). This section should contain five short bullet points, no longer than one sentence each, that relate specifically to the methods. The results of the study should not be summarised here.	<p>The section has been revised in line with the received comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst participant numbers are modest, staff were purposively sampled across a range of skill mix so similar numbers were observed</li> <li>• Patients and 'non-patients' were recruited – the latter to include people who may not engage with local dental care services</li> <li>• There will inevitably be a degree of bias given that all the practices were self-selected</li> <li>• The model of access was broadly sustained in the data but might be enhanced by greater conceptual clarity</li> <li>• Although the new practices increased access, further work is required to understand how best</li> </ul>

	to promote and encourage appropriate dental service attendance
Along with your revised manuscript, please provide a completed copy of the SRQR checklist ( <a href="https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/srqr/">https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/srqr/</a> )	Completed SRQR included
While your topic is important and your approach is good, I am concerned about the low number of people from whom you have collected data. I guess there is nothing you can do about it now. At the minimum, you need to discuss this limitation in stronger terms.	We have added acknowledgement of modest numbers and self-selection to the strengths and limitations key points. We have also acknowledged the modest number of participants to the discussion section in the context of showing the findings were compatible to those of the NHS dental contract pilots.
..weed out the random use of apostrophes, like in “Dentists’ had responded” or in “while interviews with patients took place in patient’s homes.” “Dentists responded to the contract...” instead of “Dentists’ responded to the contract”? - Page 9, line 44, should the sentence read as: “Dentists had responded to the contract” instead of “Dentists’ had responded to the contract”?	Thank you these have been corrected
For international audience, it would be good to spell out ‘NHS’ when you first mentioned it in the paper.	Added to the first line of the introduction
The reader would also benefit from a definition of skill mix in the paper.	Added to the 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph of the introduction: ‘skill-mix in dentistry describes a model which might include, for example dentists, dental therapists, dental hygienists and dental nurses’
1]. ‘Strengths and Limitations’ box - suggest using a final (5th) bullet point to acknowledge the selection process for the dental practices involved and the potential for risk of bias / generalisability / reliance upon perceptions. Overall, the bullet points here could perhaps relate more to the specific research methods employed?	The strengths and limitations have been re-written to relate to the methods employed and selection bias included as a limitation
2]. Methods - In the main manuscript there is no specific reference to external ethical review / reference number however, this may have been provided separately. I also note the link to the	The following has been added to the end of the methods section (before the PPI section):

<p>BMJ Open 'Protocol' paper but this submission may need to stand alone re. approvals. (Good to see evidence of the consent process / information sheets / consent forms detailed within this manuscript).</p>	<p>Ethics approval was obtained from the National Research Ethics Service (NRES) Committee (London – Bromley, 12/LO/0205) on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2012.</p>
<p>3]. Methods - Page 4 of 25, 2nd paragraph of section (lines 55-56), reference is made to a stakeholder group comprising of: "...service commissioners" (plural) yet the Abstract suggests just one commissioner was involved.</p>	<p>Thank you – yes, there was only one service commissioner. We have altered this to singular in the text where indicated by the reviewer.</p>
<p>4]. Methods - Page 4 of 25, 2nd paragraph (lines 50-51) - I'd have been interested to read just a little more about the sampling matrix used re. purposive sampling and how participants' experiences were categorised.</p>	<p>The dental teams were sampled by profession as outlined. We have added the sampling matrix criteria for the public and patient group at the end of the paragraph highlighted:</p> <p>The sampling matrix for the public and patient group included criteria linked to demographic factors (age, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status), risk category and treatment need.</p>
<p>5]. Methods - Page 5 of 25, 1st paragraph (lines 8-10), who was the 'non-participant observer', what was their background and did they observe all 30 patient encounters? (re. Reflexivity - I am unable to see an uploaded qualitative reporting guideline e.g. COREQ, but this may have been provided to BMJ Open separately).</p>	<p>The researcher's discipline has been added to the paper where indicated by the reviewer.</p> <p>We have now submitted the SRQR</p>
<p>6]. Methods - page 5 of 25, bottom paragraph line 56 - could delete brackets and "e.g.".</p>	<p>Thank you – these have been deleted</p>
<p>7]. Methods - page 6 of 25 'Patient and Public Involvement' section - good to see PPI being embraced throughout. The first line needs rewording (delete "and" after "research cycle"?).</p>	<p>Thank you this has been deleted</p>
<p>8]. Results - Page 7 of 25, lines 52-53 - reference to "traffic light system" is the first time the RAG is described this way. Although it is fairly obvious (and is visually depicted in the published BMJ Open Protocol paper), suggest</p>	<p>This has now been added</p>

<p>additionally inserting "RAG" here for clarity.</p>	
<p>9]. Discussion - Page 11 of 25, lines 40-41 - list of citations after text: ".....most widely cited models of access to health care 23,24,37,28". Should the last citation here be "38" instead of "28", or does the citation sequence need re-ordering?</p>	<p>Thank you for picking this up – it is 38. This has been corrected</p>
<p>10]. Discussion - What about moving forward from this study and, to take one specific example, the challenge of skill mix (identified in the paper as a challenge for dentists)? Could passing reference be made to ongoing work / policy re. "Advancing Dental Care" from Health Education England or perhaps the recent report entitled "The Future Oral &amp; Dental Workforce for England" (7th March 2019) also available via HEE website and led by Professor Jenny Gallagher? Whilst INCENTIVE does not focus upon the training of dental professionals, this issue would link to statements made in the paper's conclusion re. payments "rewarding the contribution of the dental team" and in the Abstract conclusion section re. dentists facing challenges in the "deployment of skill mix" etc.</p>	<p>Thank you for bringing these to our attention we have now referenced The Future Oral &amp; Dental Workforce for England in the discussion section in the paragraph discussing skill mix.</p>
<p>11]. Conclusion - Page 12 of 25, lines 12-13 - The Steele Report was published in June 2009.</p>	<p>Apologies for the typo – this has been corrected</p>
<p>12]. References List - Reference #37 (Baker, SR) is a duplicate of Reference #26. Minor formatting errors Refs: #13, #19, #31, #32</p>	<p>Thank you, these have now been corrected</p>