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Reviewer’s report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example, additional necessary experiments or controls, statistical mistakes, errors in interpretation.

-THE EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION ABOUT DISPARITIES IN THE INTRO DOESN’T GET CARRIED THROUGH THE REST OF THE PAPER EXCEPT THAT THE PATIENTS/PARTICIPANTS ARE DISADVANTAGED. PLEASE ADDRESS THIS THROUGHOUT.


-ON PAGE 6 LAST PARAGRAPH THE AUTHORS REFER TO TABLE 1 AS IF IT HAD DIMENSIONS OF PRIMARY CARE IN THE TABLE, IT DOES NOT, IT IS A DEMOGRAPHIC TABLE. PLEASE PROVIDE THE ACTUAL TABLE REFERRED TO.

-THE AUTHORS PROVIDE INCONSISTENT AMOUNTS OF DETAIL ABOUT THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT. FOR EXAMPLE, THERE IS A LARGE LIST OF QUESTIONS ON THE TOP OF PAGE 7 RELATING TO COMMUNICATION BUT ONLY AN EXAMPLE OF THE QUESTION ABOUT EMPOWERMENT. PLEASE BE CONSISTENT WITH THE LEVEL OF DETAIL. CONSIDER ORGANIZING IN CHART (THIS MAY HAVE BEEN WHAT THE AUTHORS HAD INTENDED WITH TABLE 1 BUT DIDN’T PROVIDE)

-PLEASE REPORT ON PARENT HEALTH CHALLENGES SOMEWHERE IF YOU ARE GOING TO ELUDE TO THEM ON PAGE 8 WITH A VAGUE STATEMENT

-THERE IS A QUOTE FROM AN INTERVIEW UNDER THE HEADING OF
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS. THISQUOTE HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH DESCRIBING THE POPULATION EXCEPT THAT THE PARENT HAS 3 KIDS. PLEASE TAKE OUT OR MOVE THIS QUOTE OR JUSTIFY WHY IT BELONGS IN THIS SECTION

-MORE IMPORTANTLY, THERE ARE NO RESULTS OF THE THEMATIC ANALYSIS PRESENTED EXCEPT FOR THE OUT OF PLACE QUOTES. THE REVIEWERS WOULD BE ADVISED TO PRESENT THE RESULTS OF THE THEMATIC ANALYSIS AND THEN USE QUOTES AS EXAMPLES TO EMPHASIZE THE THEME.

-THE AUTHORS IDENTIFIED SUBSTANTIAL PROBLEM WITH COMMUNICATION (SEE PAGE 9). 42% OF FAMILIES REPORTED LANGUAGE BARRIERS. THE AUTHORS CHOSE TO PRESENT THEapositive finding that 58% did not have barriers. THIS REVIEWER WOULD ENCOURAGE THE AUTHORS TO BE CIRCUMSPECT ABOUT THIS AND IN GENERAL ABOUT HOW THEIR DESIRE TO PROMOTE THEIR CLINICAL METHOD IMPACTS THEIR FINDINGS.

-THE PRESENTATION OF THE SCALED AVERAGES IS HARD TO UNDERSTAND IN COMPARISON TO THE PERCENTAGES PRESENTED IN TABLE 2. THIS REVIEWER WOULD ADVISE CHANGING THEM TO PERCENTAGES SO THE READER CAN UNDERSTAND THEM MORE EASILY.

-IN THE SECOND PARAGRAPH ON PAGE 10, THE AUTHORS PROVIDE SOME ADJUSTED ANALYSIS. THIS DOES NOT BELONG IN THE DESCRIPTIVE SECTION.

-THE HEADING FOR TABLE 3 COMES OUT OF THE BLUE ON PAGE 10. AFTER THE HEADING THE AUTHORS PROVIDE NO RESULTS AND NO INTRODUCTION TO TABLE 3.

UNFORTUNATELY, THE ONLY REGRESSION RESULTS ARE PROVIDED BEFORE THE SECTION ON REGRESSION RESULTS. THIS REVIEWER STRONGLY FEELS THAT THIS ENTIRE SECTION NEEDS TO ACTUALLY BE WRITTEN

-THESEXaminer IS QUITE CONFUSED AS TO WHY A LONG QUOTE ABOUT RESPECT IS IN THE REGRESSION RESULTS SECTION. PLEASE REMOVE IT. PLEASE ALSO REMOVE THE QUOTE AND SECTION ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF UNDERSTANDING THE SOCIAL CONTEXT. THEY SERVE NO PURPOSE IN A REGRESSION SECTION.

-THESEXaminer UNDERSTANDS THAT THE AUTHORS ARE TRYING TO PRESENT MIXED METHODS RESULTS. UNFORTUNATELY, JUST THROWING IN SECTIONS FROM THE QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS THAT ARE TOTALLY UNRELATED TO THE SURVEY RESULTS DOES NOT MAKE SENSE. THIS REVIEWER WOULD RECOMMEND THAT THE AUTHORS GO BACK TO THEIR DATA AND ENTIRELY REWRITE THE RESULTS SECTION.
THEY CAN EITHER GIVE RESULTS FOR THE SURVEY AND THEN GIVE RESULTS FROM THE INTERVIEWS OR TRY A MIXED METHODS PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS. FOR EXAMPLE, ON THE TOP OF PAGE 10, THE AUTHORS REPORT THAT PARENTS RESPONDED HIGH EMPOWERMENT SCORES. AFTER REPORTING THE SURVEY RESULTS (THE NUMBER) THE AUTHORS COULD GIVE AN EXAMPLE OF HOW THIS WAS BROUGHT OUT IN THE THEMATIC ANALYSIS.

- THE AUTHORS CLAIM THAT THEIR RESULTS IDENTIFY THE PROMISE OF RICHER. BUT NO COMPARISON IS MADE TO OTHER TYPES OF CARE SYSTEMS. THE READER HAS NO WAY OF KNOWING, FOR EXAMPLE, IF THE RATES OF DIFFICULTY WITH COMMUNICATION ARE HIGHER OR LOWER IN THE RICHER GROUP COMPARED TO REGULAR CARE.

- ONE MAJOR METHODOLOGIC CONCERN IS THAT THE AUTHORS ARE VERY INVESTED IN THE INITIATIVE, THIS COULD CLOUD THEIR ABILITY TO BE NEUTRAL IN THEIR INTERVIEWING AND INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS.

- Minor Essential Revisions

The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

- PLEASE BE CONSISTENT WHEN TALKING ABOUT DISPARITIES, INEQUITIES AND INEQUALITIES THROUGHOUT THE INTRODUCTION

- PLEASE SPELL OUT PHC THE FIRST TIME YOU USE IT (IN ABSTRACT)

- PLEASE REVISE THE CONCLUSION OF THE ABSTRACT TO DIRECTLY RELATE TO THE RESULTS YOU PRESENT IN THE ABSTRACT

- THE PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT NOTED PATIENT EMPOWERMENT (SEE #2 ON PAGE 4) BUT THIS REVIEWER BELIEVES THE GOAL IS PARENT EMPOWERMENT. PLEASE CLARIFY THROUGHOUT

- PLEASE BE CLEAR THROUGHOUT ABOUT THE LANGUAGES SPOKEN 'CHINESE' IS EITHER CANTONESE OR MANDARIN. IT IS REDUNDANT TO SAY CANTONESE OR CHINESE

- IN RESULTS, PLEASE NOTE THAT MOST OF THE RESPONDENTS ARE MOTHERS. THAT WILL ALTER HOW THE READER WILL INTERPRET THE EMPLOYMENT RESULTS

- Discretionary Revisions

- IT MAY BE HELPFUL TO STATE THAT MANY OF THE ASPECTS OF THE DIMENSIONS OF PRIMARY CARE FIT WITH THE US MODEL OF THE MEDICAL HOME

- IN FUTURE WORK, IT WOULD BE HELPFUL TO KNOW HOUSEHOLD
CHARACTERISTICS.
FOR EXAMPLE, DOES ANYONE IN THE HOME WORK OUTSIDE THE HOME?
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