

## 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>	Listening to pediatric primary care nurses: A qualitative study of the potential for interprofessional oral health practice in six Federally Qualified Health Centers in Massachusetts and Maryland
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Bernstein, Judith; Gebel, Christina; Vargas, Clemencia; Geltman, Paul; Walter, Ashley; Garcia, Raul; Tinanoff, Norman

### VERSION 1 - REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Denis BOURGEOIS University Lyon France
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	28-Sep-2016

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>Important recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add a chart flow please</li> <li>2. Produce questionnaire in annex (Has it been approved? How?)</li> <li>4. With introduction, an international framework of your search (i.e UNO 2011 declaration, WHO WHA recommendation, World Health Alliance)</li> <li>5. Simplify the discussion which to be in connection with the results</li> <li>6. The objective target more "limitations and expectations of nurses"</li> </ol> <p>Additional recommendations</p> <p>L 2-7: Perhaps in "discussion section"</p> <p>L-14-19: Same</p> <p>L 23 (4) - 4 (5) Same</p> <p>L 22 (5): IRB please explain</p> <p>L1-3 (7): Please to precise the choice of the size of the sample. Why 10 nurses. what about ther impact of other answers in your paper?</p> <p>Results: PLease see R2.</p> <p>L6-7 page 15: it is results</p> <p>L7-10: Too far from the goal</p> <p>L16 (16) -6 (17): Same</p>
-------------------------	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Lynn VanderWielen, PhD, MHP University of Colorado, Department of Family Medicine, School of Medicine, Colorado, United States of America
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	03-Oct-2016

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. This work is of critical importance to whole-person care and interprofessional collaboration. A few points for consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The study goal is first made explicit in the Methods Analytic Strategy section: "Data analyses were designed to explore how difference in professional training, expertise, and culture affect the integration of oral health promotion and dental referral into a well-</li> </ol>
-------------------------	---

	<p>child visit." If this is the goal, it would be better suited to include in the introduction section to frame up the study.</p> <p>2) If the study goal is defined as above, the results section does not correspond to achieving this goal. For instance, the three emerging themes do not explore professional training, expertise, or culture but rather recognition of the importance of oral health, facilitators and barriers to oral health integration, and recommendations. It is important that the results reflect the study goal.</p> <p>3) Can the authors please elaborate on the three individuals who did not participate in interviews? What were the reasons for non-participation? Were these three individuals from one specific field?</p> <p>4) How were the clinics selected? I see that they represent a 'continuum of oral health integration' but how was this assessed? Is this simply knowledge of the research team?</p> <p>5) Please elaborate on the limitations of this study.</p> <p>I hope these recommendations prove helpful. Again, thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript.</p>
--	---

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1 Denis BOURGEOIS

Institution and Country: University Lyon France

Important recommendations:

1. Add a chart flow please.

We have described the composition in words, because of the small number of participants. See sample section.

2 & 3. Produce questionnaire in annex .

The interview schedule was approved by two university institutional review boards, and items were derived from a previous national study. The questionnaire has been uploaded for publication in the annex.

4. With introduction, an international framework of your search (i.e UNO 2011 declaration, WHO WHA recommendation, World Health Alliance)

A new paragraph has been added to the introduction (p.4, lines 18-22)

5. Smplify the discussion which to be in connection with the results

Both the results and the discussion have new subheads, and the issues about correspondence of results with aims have been resolved with new, specific language.

6. The objective target more " limitations and expectations of nurses"

If we understand this correctly, we have focused the objectives on beliefs, knowledge and barriers of nurses.

Additional recommendations

L 2-7: Perhaps in "discussion section"

L-14-19: Same

L 23 (4) - 4 (5) Same

We did not move this material, because we thought it was necessary to set up why IPC is an important approach to the problem of poor oral health among high risk children seen at FQHCs, but we did clarify and shorten.

L 22 (5): IRB please explain

Institutional review board is now spelled out.

L1-3 (7): Please to precise the choice of the size of the sample. Why 10 nurses. what about ther impact of other answers in your paper?

This material is now covered in the sample section and under limitations.

Results: PLease see R2.

L6-7 page 15: it is results

L7-10: Too far from the goal.

L16 (16) -6 (17): Same

We agree and have removed this material.

Reviewer: 2 Lynn VanderWielen, PhD, MHP

1) The study goal is first made explicit in the Methods Analytic Strategy section: "Data analyses were designed to explore how difference in professional training, expertise, and culture affect the integration of oral health promotion and dental referral into a well-child visit." If this is the goal, it would be better suited to include in the introduction section to frame up the study.

2) If the study goal is defined as above, the results section does not correspond to achieving this goal. For instance, the three emerging themes do not explore professional training, expertise, or culture but rather recognition of the importance of oral health, facilitators and barriers to oral health integration, and recommendations. It is important that the results reflect the study goal.

Thank you for pointing this out. We have re-written to address these related issues (addressing related comments 1 & 2).

3) Can the authors please elaborate on the three individuals who did not participate in interviews? What were the reasons for non-participation? Were these three individuals from one specific field? See sample section for clarification. All nurses who were approached to participate agreed to enter the study and all

completed the interviews.

4) How were the clinics selected? I see that they represent a 'continuum of oral health integration' but how was this assessed? Is this simply knowledge of the research team?

We gathered data from these clinics. The process is now described in the design section.

5) Please elaborate on the limitations of this study.

We added the limitations of small sample and qualitative approach (depth vs. breadth) limiting generalizability.