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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions:

None really, though I would strongly advocate for completing all minor essential revisions that can be completed (as requested in the first review), unless there is a compelling argument for not completing those (e.g., unless the reviewer simply misunderstood the point they were contesting or over-estimated the available literature to be summarized under particular areas touched on in the Background).

Minor essential revisions:

Suggestions for completing the literature review summary (in the prior round of review) were not followed. In particular, this paper should refer to at least some quantitative analyses on the barriers to adherence (not solely the types of interventions with demonstrated efficacy for improving adherence) and at least some qualitative findings regarding the role or perceptions of interventions (not solely the barriers). I don't think that evidence regarding effective intervention strategies or components are always exactly/merely the flip side of evidence regarding barriers. They are two distinct (though interrelated) bodies of evidence of relevance to this work.

Suggestions for improving the Methods section were partially incorporated. However, while it is now clear that the application of Quality Assessment (or CASP) criteria did not lead to the exclusion of any otherwise eligible study (and this is helpful information), it is not clear what the application of CASP criteria did lend to the content or structure of this paper. Having read this with that question in mind, I'm still not sure why the authors bothered with the CASP; did those criteria inform the discussion of limitations, or the emphasis given to findings from particular articles (and muting of specific findings from others, unless/until those themes were reinforced through their inclusion in another one of the reviewed articles performing better on CASP)?

Discretionary Revisions

Thank you for moving most quotations into the detailed Box 1 at the end. Those are useful for reference, provide interest and nicely illustrate the coding process behind this paper, without distracting from the flow of the review, which requires taking a step back from any individual interview study. I would still advise moving
the quotation in Section "3. Child resistance" (about the caregiver and the child both having a difficult time) out of the body of the article as well. It seems to be the last caregiver quotation remaining in the body of this article, and as mentioned in my previous review, it fails to stand alone as excerpted there. I am afraid it distracts from the clarity of this review without adding anything in terms of resonance, realism or a window into a particular caregiver’s experience/perspective. There may be (among the original papers reviewed) a quotation that would immediately convey the dilemma of caregivers dealing with child resistance, but I would say that one sentence is not it. More importantly, I don’t think it is the job of the review to give that kind of individual example, at least not in the main results section. I believe Box 1 already includes a longer version of that example.

Overall, this is a thoughtful paper and remains a largely satisfying read, and I was glad to see someone undertaking this kind of review and summary of the qualitative literature on factors influencing caregiver/pediatric (non-)adherence.
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