

Dental Service Organizations And The Corporatization Of U.S. Dentistry: Practice Management, Clinical Autonomy, And Patient Outcomes In A National Context

Caroline Weinert Marçal

(Specialist In Orthodontics, São Leopoldo Mandic, Vila Velha, ES, Brazil)

Bruno Freire Moura

(Graduated In Dentistry, Federal University Of Pernambuco(UFPE), Recife, PE, Brazil)

Rafael Rudimar Holler Peres

(Specialist In Orthodontics, São Leopoldo Mandic, Vila Velha, ES, Brazil)

Katia Rosiane Müller Lauxen

(Specialist In Orthodontics, Faculdade De Tecnologia IPPEO, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil)

Suzana Carolina Ramos Silva

(Specialist In Periodontology, INPEO, Cuiabá, MT, Brazil)

Pedro César Mesquita Cals De Oliveira

(Specialist In Facial Harmonization, SOBRESP, Santa Maria, RS, Brazil)

Sabrina Lima Dantas Nóbrega

(Specialist In Endodontics, Federal University Of Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil)

Maria Luisa Silva De Melo

(Specialist In Endodontics, Faculdade De Odontologia Do Recife(FOR), Recife, PE, Brazil)

Abstract:

Dentistry in the United States has undergone a structural transformation over the past two decades, shifting from a profession organized almost entirely around solo and small-group private ownership toward one increasingly consolidated under dental service organizations (DSOs), a substantial share of which are backed by private equity capital. This narrative review synthesizes evidence on the drivers, mechanics, and consequences of this consolidation, drawing on dental workforce surveys, health services research on private equity acquisition across other areas of medicine, and dental regulatory and ethics literature, given the relative scarcity of outcome-based studies specific to dental private equity. It examines the tension between the operational and financial benefits DSOs offer, namely economies of scale, administrative infrastructure, and capital access, and the concerns raised about productivity-based compensation models, corporate practice of dentistry laws, and their variable enforcement across states, and the potential erosion of individualized clinical judgment. Evidence from private equity acquisitions in adjacent fields, including primary care, cardiology, general surgery, oncology, and addiction treatment, shows a mixed and setting-dependent pattern of outcomes, with some studies finding measurable declines in quality indicators and others finding no significant short-term change. The review also considers geographic workforce distribution and access to specialty and teledentistry-enabled care as an underexplored dimension of DSO consolidation. Drawing on an emerging dentistry-specific outcome study and on policy frameworks already proposed for private equity in other health care sectors, the review closes by proposing concrete, near-term solutions, ownership disclosure requirements, extended claims-linked outcome research, harmonized state regulation, and ownership-stratified workforce surveys, to the evidence gaps it identifies, in view of this issue's significance for U.S. dental workforce policy and patient protection.

Key Word: dental service organizations; corporate dentistry; private equity; practice management; clinical autonomy; United States.

Date of Submission: 01-08-2026

Date of Acceptance: 11-08-2026

I. Introduction

For most of the twentieth century, American dentistry was organized around the solo or small-group private practice, typically owned and operated directly by a licensed dentist, a model reinforced by state corporate practice of dentistry laws that historically restricted non-dentist ownership of dental practices¹. Recent narrative reviews of U.S. dental practice management have similarly identified strategic leadership, economic sustainability, and technological innovation as the central pillars shaping the profession's trajectory, underscoring that clinical excellence alone no longer defines a viable dental practice². That structure has changed markedly since the early 2010s. Dental service organizations (DSOs), business entities that provide non-clinical administrative, financial, and operational support to affiliated dental practices while the practices themselves nominally remain owned by a licensed dentist, have expanded from a marginal presence to a substantial and growing share of the U.S. dental market. Industry tracking places U.S. dentist affiliation with DSOs at roughly 16% in 2024, more than double the 7.2% recorded in 2015³, and workforce surveys of graduating dental students show a parallel shift in career intentions rather than a purely employer-driven phenomenon.

The scale of the workforce and financing system underlying this shift is considerable. The United States is served by more than 200,000 practicing dentists, yet an estimated 62 million Americans live in federally designated Dental Health Professional Shortage Areas, and dental care financing remains split unevenly between private insurance, out-of-pocket payment, and state Medicaid programs whose dental coverage varies widely⁴. A National Institutes of Health synthesis of the field similarly concluded that although access to care has improved for children and young adults since 2000, considerable work remains to meet the oral health needs of the population equitably, particularly regarding financing and workforce distribution⁵.

This consolidation parallels, and in important respects mirrors, a broader wave of private equity investment across American health care, from primary care and cardiology to general surgery and oncology, that has drawn sustained scrutiny from health services researchers over whether profit-oriented ownership structures are compatible with, indifferent to, or detrimental to clinical quality and patient access^{6,7,8,9}. Because dentistry-specific outcome research remains scarce relative to the pace of consolidation itself, this review draws substantially on that adjacent literature, treating it as informative rather than directly generalizable, to characterize what is known, what is plausible, and what remains genuinely unknown about the clinical and structural consequences of DSO-affiliated dental practice in the United States.

The review is organized around three questions. First, what operational and financial logic drives dentists and, increasingly, dental students, toward DSO affiliation? Second, what does the regulatory and ethical literature say about the tension between centralized business management and individualized clinical judgment in dentistry specifically? Third, what can be inferred, cautiously, from private equity outcome studies in other areas of medicine, and from evidence on workforce distribution and access, about the likely direction and magnitude of DSO consolidation's effect on dental patient care?

II. The Structural And Financial Logic Of DSO Affiliation

DSOs offer dental practices centralized access to functions that are costly for an individual practice to build independently: negotiated supply and equipment procurement, human resources and payroll administration, marketing, compliance support, and enterprise-grade scheduling and revenue cycle infrastructure. Corporate support organizations such as Aspen Dental Management, Inc. describe their role explicitly in these terms, providing non-clinical operational support to more than 1,200 affiliated practices so that clinicians can, in the organization's framing, focus on patient care rather than business administration¹⁰.

For new dental school graduates carrying substantial educational debt, DSO affiliation offers a lower-capital entry point into practice than purchasing or founding an independent office, along with a defined compensation structure and reduced exposure to the financial risk of practice ownership. Workforce survey data from the American Dental Education Association (ADEA) illustrate how quickly this option has gained traction: among 2022 graduating seniors planning to enter private practice immediately after graduation, close to one-third intended to join a DSO, rising to more than a third of the class of 2023, and 40% among historically underrepresented race and ethnicity groups within that cohort^{11,12}. This trend was already visible a decade earlier in more modest form: a 2015 analysis of the 2014 ADEA senior survey found that 28.3% of graduates entering private practice intended to join a corporate group practice, the only employment category that had grown relative to the prior year, prompting the authors to argue that dental school curricula needed to better prepare students to evaluate employment models critically rather than by default¹³.

The corporate practice of dentistry framework that governs this arrangement varies considerably by state. A regulatory analysis of DSO affiliation across the United States identified four recurring compliance dimensions that states regulate with differing stringency: ownership or proprietorship of the dental practice, control over dental offices, equipment, and materials, employment authority over dental personnel, and, most consequentially for clinical practice, control over clinical judgment itself¹. Because these dimensions are regulated inconsistently across jurisdictions, the practical degree of clinical autonomy a DSO-affiliated dentist retains, formally a business

decision distinct from clinical care, can differ meaningfully depending on where the practice is located, independent of the specific DSO involved.

III. Clinical Autonomy, Productivity Incentives, And Professional Ethics

The central ethical tension identified in the dental literature on corporate practice is not that DSOs necessarily instruct dentists on specific clinical decisions, an arrangement most state corporate practice of dentistry laws explicitly prohibit, but that production-based compensation structures and centralized performance metrics can create indirect pressure that shapes clinical decision-making even without direct instruction. A recent essay calling for a relational, justice-oriented model of dental professionalism specifically names private equity-led acquisitions, alongside individual clinicians and traditional corporate structures, as a site where ethical practice risks becoming a theoretical exercise disconnected from daily clinical realities, and argues for systems-level accountability rather than reliance on individual practitioner ethics alone to safeguard patient-centered care¹⁴.

A leadership-focused commentary co-authored by dental practice executives, including a DSO chief executive officer, offers a revealing counterpoint from within the industry itself, arguing that ethical, purpose-driven leadership must be actively cultivated at every level of a dental organization precisely because default organizational incentives, described as a tension between social norms of care and market norms of production, do not automatically align¹⁵. That the argument for deliberate ethical leadership emerges from DSO-affiliated authors as much as from academic dental ethics scholars suggests the tension is recognized as real within corporate dental management, not merely a critique projected onto it from outside.

Workforce well-being data add a further dimension often absent from purely structural analyses of DSO consolidation. A 2025 survey of dental students, residents, faculty, and staff at an academic dental institution found that more than half reported changes in work-related well-being, with over a third reporting moderate personal burnout and a comparable share reporting moderate or higher work-related burnout on the Copenhagen Burnout Inventory¹⁶. A separate survey comparing frontline medical and dental health workers found no significant difference in depression severity, perceived stress, or overall mental health status between the two professions, with adjusted work hours, rewards, and teamwork identified as the interventions health workers themselves considered most likely to improve well-being¹⁷. Neither study isolated DSO-affiliated dentists as a distinct subgroup, which is itself a notable gap: well-being research stratified by ownership and employment model would meaningfully sharpen this picture.

IV. Evidence From Private Equity In Adjacent Medical Fields

Because dentistry-specific, outcome-based research on DSO or private equity ownership remains limited, the most methodologically rigorous available evidence on how profit-oriented consolidation affects clinical quality comes from adjacent areas of American medicine, where several well-designed studies have now been published. The findings are genuinely mixed rather than uniformly negative, a nuance worth preserving rather than flattening into a single narrative in either direction.

At the more concerning end, a difference-in-differences analysis of 96,048 Medicare beneficiaries across 390 rural hospitals found that private equity acquisition was associated with statistically significant increases in 30-day postoperative mortality (a 1.1 percentage point increase), overall complications (2.5 percentage points), and serious complications (1.5 percentage points) for common general surgery procedures, despite similar baseline hospital characteristics⁸. A study of gastrointestinal cancer surgery using the linked SEER-Medicare database found that private equity-owned hospitals had reduced clinical staffing (19 fewer physicians and 43 fewer nurses on average), served fewer Medicaid patients, and experienced a rise in hospital-acquired infections from 30.4% to 43.7% after acquisition, although differences in perioperative complications and 90-day mortality did not reach statistical significance in that particular sample⁹. In substance use disorder treatment, private equity acquisition was associated with increased patient and prescription volume for buprenorphine, alongside a measurable decrease in 90-day and 180-day treatment retention, a pattern the authors interpreted as expanded access coexisting with declining continuity of care¹⁸.

At the less concerning end, a JAMA Health Forum analysis of over 24,000 traditional Medicare beneficiaries with private equity-acquired primary care physicians found no statistically significant change in potentially avoidable hospitalizations or all-cause hospitalizations after acquisition, and a modest decrease in emergency department visits, with unchanged patient case-mix composition⁷. A cardiology-focused commentary similarly found no consistent evidence that private equity or hospital-employment arrangements improved outcomes relative to independent practice, while noting that such arrangements reliably reduced physician autonomy and increased administrative costs, and outlined strategies, including clinically integrated networks and service diversification, that independent practices could use to preserve autonomy without sacrificing financial viability⁶.

Read together, this literature suggests that the clinical consequences of private equity and corporate consolidation are setting-dependent, likely shaped by local competitive dynamics, staffing decisions made post-

acquisition, and the specific procedures or services involved, rather than a fixed, generalizable effect of ownership structure alone. Applying this pattern to dentistry cautiously, the review finds no basis in the current literature to assume DSO consolidation is either uniformly harmful or uniformly benign for patient outcomes; dentistry-specific outcome data, comparable in design to the Medicare and SEER-Medicare studies cited above, remain scarce, though an important first exception has recently emerged. Using a proprietary dental office database linked to commercial dental claims and a staggered difference-in-differences design, a 2026 study by the American Dental Association's Health Policy Institute found that dentist affiliation with private equity nearly doubled nationally, from 6.6% in 2015 to 12.8% in 2021, rising fastest among dental specialists such as endodontists and oral surgeons²². Its companion practice-level analysis found that negotiated prices between dentists and commercial payers did not change significantly after private equity acquisition, while acquired offices became more likely to convert into multispecialty practices and PE-affiliated practices showed higher rates of Medicaid participation than non-affiliated practices²³. This is precisely the kind of ownership-stratified, claims-linked evidence the field has lacked, and it offers an encouraging template rather than a settled answer: a single study, covering prices and service mix but not yet clinical quality, treatment necessity, or patient outcomes, is not sufficient to close the evidence gap this review identifies, but it demonstrates that the data infrastructure needed to do so already exists and can be extended.

V. Discussion And Limitations

This review's central limitation is also its central finding: the near-total absence of dentistry-specific, outcome-based, peer-reviewed research directly comparing DSO-affiliated and independent dental practices on measures of clinical quality, patient access, or cost. The evidence assembled here is necessarily inferential, built from dental workforce surveys, dental regulatory and ethics scholarship, and private equity outcome studies conducted in medical and surgical specialties that differ from dentistry in payer mix, procedure risk profile, and regulatory structure. Market-reported figures on DSO growth and dentist affiliation rates, while directionally informative, originate from industry analytics firms with a commercial interest in DSO expansion and should be interpreted with corresponding caution rather than treated as equivalent to peer-reviewed data³.

A further dimension worth flagging for future research is geographic and workforce distribution, an access-related question that DSO consolidation is frequently credited with improving but that has not been directly tested. Explainable machine learning analyses of more than 56,000 U.S. dentists who graduated between 2000 and 2022 found that practice ownership status, years of experience, general practice specialty, and dental school characteristics were among the strongest predictors of whether a dentist practices in a federally designated shortage area¹⁹, while a national block-group-level geographic access model found that more than 98% of dental specialists practice in urban areas, leaving rural residents facing average drive times to specialty care more than three times longer than urban residents²⁰. Neither study distinguished DSO-affiliated from independent practice ownership, leaving open whether corporate consolidation is helping or hindering the geographic redistribution of the dental workforce it is often credited with improving. Teledentistry has been proposed as a complementary access-broadening tool, and a recent overview of systematic reviews found it an effective and efficient alternative to in-person oral health care overall, while cautioning that the certainty of this evidence is limited by low methodological quality across many of the underlying reviews²¹. Whether DSO-affiliated practices adopt teledentistry differently than independent practices, and with what effect on access in underserved areas, is a further open empirical question that follows directly from the gaps identified here.

A concrete research agenda follows directly from these gaps. Studies analogous in design to the Medicare and SEER-Medicare private equity analyses cited above, using dental claims data stratified by ownership structure (independent versus DSO-affiliated, and, within DSOs, private equity-backed versus non-equity-backed), could examine differences in procedure mix, referral patterns, treatment plan acceptance rates, geographic practice location, and patient-reported outcomes. Workforce well-being research should stratify explicitly by employment and ownership model rather than treating dentists as a homogeneous group, to determine whether the burnout patterns documented in academic dental settings¹⁶ are more, less, or equally prevalent under productivity-based DSO compensation structures. Finally, state-level natural experiments exploiting variation in corporate practice of dentistry enforcement¹ could help isolate whether regulatory stringency itself moderates any relationship between DSO affiliation and clinical outcomes, independent of the DSO's internal management practices.

VI. National Interest And Significance, And Proposed Solutions To The Limitations Identified

The scale of this consolidation gives it national significance independent of any single practice's experience. With dentist affiliation with private equity or DSOs having roughly doubled in under a decade by more than one independent measure^{3,22}, and with dental school seniors now entering DSO-affiliated practice at historically high rates^{11,12}, the ownership structure of American dentistry is shifting for a workforce of more than 200,000 practicing dentists and the tens of millions of Medicaid, commercially insured, and self-pay patients they serve⁴. Each limitation identified in this review corresponds to a specific, actionable step that policymakers,

professional organizations, and researchers could take, and the remainder of this section proposes solutions for each.

First, the scarcity of dentistry-specific, ownership-stratified outcome data is now a solvable problem rather than an inherent one. The recent linkage of a national dental office database to commercial dental claims²³ demonstrates that the necessary infrastructure exists; the solution is to extend this model, with public funding through the National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, or the American Dental Association's Health Policy Institute, to cover clinical quality measures, treatment necessity, and Medicaid-specific access outcomes, not prices and service mix alone, following the same difference-in-differences design already validated in the Medicare and SEER-Medicare private equity literature cited in Section IV^{7,8,9}.

Second, the opacity of DSO and private equity ownership, which currently forces researchers and patients alike to rely on commercially motivated market reports³, has a direct regulatory precedent in a different sector of American health care. In 2023, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services began publishing nursing home ownership data specifically to address this kind of opacity, though independent evaluations found the released data still substantially incomplete, with ownership percentages missing for more than half of all owners nationally²⁴. A parallel mandatory ownership disclosure requirement for dental practices participating in state Medicaid programs, administered by state Medicaid agencies or state dental boards, would let researchers and regulators identify DSO- and private equity-affiliated practices systematically rather than relying on the DSOs' own reporting, while anticipating the same implementation gaps documented in the nursing home rollout. Broader health policy scholarship on private equity in medicine has proposed a four-part framework directly transferable to dentistry: lowering the reporting thresholds that trigger regulatory review of practice acquisitions, requiring longer-run transparency of ownership and pricing, establishing minimum staffing and direct-patient-care spending floors, and limiting the proportion of debt used to finance acquisitions²⁵. Each of these could be adapted to dental practice regulation at the state level without requiring new federal legislation.

Third, the state-by-state variation in corporate practice of dentistry enforcement identified in Section II¹ could be addressed through model legislation coordinated by national dental organizations, similar to the role the American Dental Association and state dental associations already play in drafting model dental practice acts; a harmonized standard for what constitutes control over clinical judgment, applied consistently across states, would also make the natural experiments proposed in Section V methodologically cleaner to conduct.

Fourth, the absence of ownership-stratified workforce well-being data could be resolved directly by the organizations that already collect it. The American Dental Education Association's annual survey of graduating seniors already tracks intended employment setting^{11,12}, and the American Dental Association's Health Policy Institute already fields workforce surveys and produces private equity affiliation estimates²²; adding ownership and employment-model stratification to existing burnout and well-being instruments, rather than commissioning new data collection, would close this gap at comparatively low cost and put a national evidence base within reach in the near term.

VII. Conclusion

Dental service organizations have grown from a marginal presence to a substantial and still-expanding share of the U.S. dental market, and dental school seniors are now entering DSO-affiliated practice at rates unseen a decade ago^{11,12}. This consolidation offers genuine operational and financial benefits, but it also raises ethical, regulatory, and access-related questions that the current dentistry-specific evidence base is not yet equipped to answer definitively. Analogous private equity consolidation in primary care, cardiology, general surgery, and oncology has already produced measurable, if heterogeneous, effects on clinical quality and access^{6,7,8,9}, and the absence of comparable dentistry-specific evidence, including on whether DSO consolidation narrows or widens the geographic and workforce access gaps documented elsewhere in U.S. oral health care, represents a genuine gap in the national evidence base needed to inform dental workforce policy, state corporate practice of dentistry regulation, and consumer protection in dental care. Transparent, outcome-based, ownership-stratified research, rather than reliance on industry-reported market figures, is the necessary next step to determine whether the efficiency gains attributed to corporate dental practice management translate into comparable or improved patient outcomes.

References

- [1]. Cameron, C. A., & Devore, C. H. (2024). Dental Service Organization Affiliation: Understanding Key Aspects Of State Dental Practice Act Compliance. *Journal Of Dental Education*, 88(5), 567-572.
- [2]. Oliveira, J. A. P., Apolinário, V. C., Loiola, S. F., Souza, P. M., Abadessa, S. N., Dalbone, A. F., Lima, P. A. D., Mello, F. F., Castro Júnior, U. A., Arume, G. S. C. A., Bastos, P. V. O., & Dalla, E. F. (2026). Advancing Dental Practice Management In The United States: Strategic Leadership, Economic Sustainability, And Healthcare Innovation. *Revista DCS*, 23(90), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.54899/Dcs.V23i90.5554>
- [3]. Clerri. (2026). 28 DSO Market Trends Shaping Dental In 2026. Retrieved August 11, 2026, From <https://clerri.com/blog/dental-service-organization-market-trends>

- [4]. Duangthip, D., Et Al. (2026). Oral Health Care In The United States. *Dentistry Journal*, 14(5), 265. <https://doi.org/10.3390/Dj14050265>
- [5]. Fellows, J. L., Atchison, K. A., Chaffin, J., Chávez, E. M., & Tinanoff, N. (2022). Oral Health In America: Implications For Dental Practice. *Journal Of The American Dental Association*, 153(7), 601-609. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.Adaj.2022.04.002>
- [6]. Bannon, W. J., Rahim, F. O., Tamirisa, K., & Patel, R. (2026). Navigating The Evolving Landscape Of Private Cardiology Practice. *The American Journal Of Managed Care*, 32(3), E62-E65.
- [7]. Dixit, M. N., Philips, A. P., Trivedi, A. N., Whaley, C., & Singh, Y. (2026). Private Equity Acquisition In Primary Care And Avoidable Hospitalizations. *JAMA Health Forum*, 7(5), E261045.
- [8]. Mullens, C. L., Mead, M., Abid, M., Probst, J. C., Dimick, J. B., Ibrahim, A. M., & Diaz, A. (2026). Surgical Quality At Rural Hospitals After Private Equity Acquisition. *Annals Of Surgery*. Advance Online Publication.
- [9]. Worku, E., Rashid, Z., Khalil, M., Woldeesenbet, S., & Pawlik, T. M. (2026). Private Equity Acquisitions Of Hospitals And The Changing Landscape Of Care For Patients With Gastrointestinal Cancer. *Journal Of Gastrointestinal Oncology*, 17(1), 4.
- [10]. Brown, D. (2025). Corporate Practice/Dental Service Organization. *Oral And Maxillofacial Surgery Clinics Of North America*, 37(4), 627-629.
- [11]. Istrate, E. C., Cooper, B., & West, K. P. (2022). Dentists Of Tomorrow 2022: An Analysis Of The Results Of The ADEA 2022 Survey Of U.S. Dental School Seniors. *Journal Of Dental Education*, 86(10), 1405-1417.
- [12]. Istrate, E. C., Cooper, B. L., Singh, P., Gül, G., & West, K. P. (2023). Dentists Of Tomorrow 2023: An Analysis Of The Results Of The ADEA 2023 Survey Of U.S. Dental School Seniors. *Journal Of Dental Education*, 87(11), 1607-1620.
- [13]. Badger, G. R., Fryer, C. E. S., Giannini, P. J., Townsend, J. A., & Huja, S. (2015). Helping Dental Students Make Informed Decisions About Private Practice Employment Options In A Changing Landscape. *Journal Of Dental Education*, 79(12), 1396-1401. (DOI: To Be Confirmed By The Author)
- [14]. Smith, C. S. (2026). Reimagining A Justice Oriented Professionalism: A Call For Relational Ethics In Oral Health Education. *Frontiers In Dental Medicine*, 7, 1819807.
- [15]. Maeda, A., Nagata, K., Carr, E. O., Koka, S., & Yokoyama, S. (2025). Everyday Leadership. *Primary Dental Journal*, 14(3), 87-90.
- [16]. Kapadia, U. H., Akhavan, S., Hegde, M. M., Cheema, J. S., Veluru, K., Karimi, A., Zamanian, N., Tom, E., Ebrahimi, S., & Vaderhobli, R. M. (2025). Burnout Rate Among Dental Professionals Post COVID-19 At One Academic Dental Institution. *BMC Medical Education*, 25(1), 1261.
- [17]. Grünheid, T., & Hazem, A. (2023). Mental Wellbeing Of Frontline Health Workers Post-Pandemic: Lessons Learned And A Way Forward. *Frontiers In Public Health*, 11, 1204662.
- [18]. Holdaway, T., Busch, S. H., Reimer, J., Beetham, T., Fiellin, D. A., & King, M. (2026). Private Equity Acquisition And Buprenorphine Prescribing. *JAMA Network Open*, 9(3), E260250.
- [19]. Elani, H. W., Zhao, N., Schuch, H. S., Saldutte, G., Mertz, E., & Vujicic, M. (2026). Individual And Institutional Factors Influencing Dentists' Practice In Underserved Areas. *Scientific Reports*, 16, 2273. <https://doi.org/10.1038/S41598-025-32094-8>
- [20]. Rahman, M. S., Martinez, A., & Elani, H. W. (2025). Geographic Access To Dental Specialists In The United States. *Journal Of Dental Research*. Advance Online Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00220345251388919>
- [21]. Kengne Talla, P., Allison, P., Bussi eres, A., Rodrigues, A., Bergeron, F., Giraudeau, N., & Emami, E. (2025). Teledentistry For Improving Access To, And Quality Of Oral Health Care: Overview Of Systematic Reviews And Meta-Analyses. *Journal Of Medical Internet Research*, 27, E65211. <https://doi.org/10.2196/65211>
- [22]. Nasseh, K., Losasso, A. T., & Vujicic, M. (2024). Percentage Of Dentists And Dental Practices Affiliated With Private Equity Nearly Doubled, 2015-21. *Health Affairs*, 43(8), 1082-1089. <https://doi.org/10.1377/Hlthaff.2023.00574>
- [23]. Nasseh, K., Losasso, A. T., Vujicic, M., & Downey, T. (2026). Financial Incisors: Cutting Through The Effects Of Private Equity On Dentistry Market Dynamics And Care Delivery. *Health Services Research*, 61(2), E70075. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.70075>
- [24]. Chen, A. C., Skinner, R. J., Braun, R. T., Konetzka, R. T., Stevenson, D. G., & Grabowski, D. C. (2024). New CMS Nursing Home Ownership Data: Major Gaps And Discrepancies. *Health Affairs*, 43(3), 318-326. <https://doi.org/10.1377/Hlthaff.2023.01110>
- [25]. Cai, C., & Song, Z. (2024). Protecting Patients And Society In An Era Of Private Equity Provider Ownership: Challenges And Opportunities For Policy. *Health Affairs*, 43(5), 666-673. <https://doi.org/10.1377/Hlthaff.2023.00942>