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Author's response to reviews: see over
Authors’ Response to Reviewers’ Comments and Suggestions

Major comments from the Editor:

We would be grateful if you could address the comments in a revised manuscript and provide a cover letter giving a point-by-point response to the concerns.

--Response: We have carefully reviewed each reviewer’s comments and suggestions, and have made corresponding and/or necessary changes in the revision. Please find below our responses.

Referee(s)’ Comments to Author:

Referee: Jon Quach

Minor essential revisions
Focus groups

- Did the focus group facilitator have any expertise in child sleep problems? This may have biased the discussion and should be noted.

--Response: Thanks for the comment. The focus group facilitator did not have any expertise in child sleep problems. As a psychologist at the rehabilitation center, the facilitator conducted semi-structured sessions using a discussion guide developed by the research team. Of note, the facilitator was not a member of the research team. We have included this information in the Methods section (page 6).

Data Analysis

- Please include the inter-rater reliability between the manuscript coders.

--Response: As suggested, we have included the information on inter-rater reliability in the revision (pages 7, 8).

To establish inter-rater reliability between the transcript coders, intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) was calculated based on the method of Shrout and Fleiss (1979).
Results

-Did caregivers comment on quality of information they received from service providers and whether it was appropriate for their child?

--Response: In this study, caregivers did not comment on quality of information they received from service providers or whether it was appropriate for their child. This current study focused on the attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions of caregivers and rehabilitation providers about child sleep.

-Given interventions can be delivered in various ways, i.e. online resources, face-to-face, is any data available about preferred ways caregivers want to receive information and preferred delivery methods by the health professionals?

--Response: Thank you for the comment. There is no data available about the preferred ways that caregivers want to receive information or preferred delivery methods by the health professionals. We have included this point as the future research plan in our Discussion section (page 17).

Discussion

- A general discussion about cultural differences in terms of sleep beliefs would be helpful to provide context for the discussion. Inclusion in the introduction may also be helpful.

--Response: As suggested, we have included a general discussion about cultural differences in terms of sleep beliefs and provided two references in the Discussion section (pages 13, 17).


Discretionary revisions

-Were there any differences in caregiver responses based on whether their child did or did not have a sleep problem or frequency of sleep problem?

--Response: Thank you for this question. Our study focused on the attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, and perceptions of both caregivers and rehabilitation providers about children’s sleep. We did not examine the differences in caregiver responses based on whether their child had a sleep problem.
Reviewer: Vanessa Ann Vigilante

Reviewer's report:
The data gleaned from this study is useful and readily applicable to clinical care.

--Response: Thank you.

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Referring to line 62, the sentence implies that all children in the study used assistive devices, however I am not aware of assistive devices for ADHD per se. If it is meant that the children used assistive devices for another disability and also have co-morbid ADHD then perhaps that could be clarified.

--Response: Thank you for the comment. To avoid the confusion, we have added ‘/or’ after ‘…assistive devices’.

2. Line 66, there appears to be a typographical error preceding the number 18.

--Response: We added “adult” before “caregivers aged…” in line 66 and added “among” before “18” in line 68.

3. Table 2, there appears to be a typographical error preceding the number 10 in the last line.

--Response: We have added “was” before “>=10 hours”.

4. It will be helpful to indicate method of test analysis, such as indicating that the method of repetition was used to identify themes. Additionally, it will be helpful to indicate the method used to code text such as cutting and sorting. Please see the article in the following link for further information http://fmx.sagepub.com/content/15/1/85.full.pdf

--Response: As suggested, we have added the reference and provided more information about data analysis (page 7).

Discretionary Revisions
1. A suggestion to present data from Table 1 in text form only, thereby deleting this table.

--Response: Thank you for the suggestion. We respectfully request that we be allowed to keep Table 1 in our manuscript. The table provides readers with a description of the participants’ characteristics. As such, readers are able to better understand the study population that participated in the focus group discussions.