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Reviewer's report:

I thought this was a very well written article. I have a couple of small queries.

On page 5 I didn't understand the role of the parallel interview study. Were all the therapists in this study interviewed for some other study? Also on page 5 (and other places, e.g. page 6 under Results), I wasn't sure I understood the term response rate. Does this mean the percentage of therapists who agreed to participate in the study, i.e. allow their data to be accessed? Still on page 5, I thought the meaning of the phrase "Fifteen therapists gives an effect sample size of 15 at the therapist level....." could be clarified. And again, perhaps the use of response rate re 50-60%.

On page 6, some comment about the representativeness of the sample might be valuable, e.g. low participation in certain locations and the vast majority being senior therapists. Representativeness is mentioned later on page 10, but comments are not specific to such variables and how they might impact generalizability.

On pages 8 and 9, I wondered about the value of discussing individual services and therapists. I didn't know whether this added value to the paper and I wondered whether some services/individuals might be identifiable.

Under Discussion, I have to wonder whether modifying behaviours of providing treatment and placing children on review would be good ideas, even if they reduce LoT and possibly wait times? Some brief consideration is given to this issue, but perhaps more is warranted.

I thought Box 1 was a bit repetitive of material in the text.

It wasn't immediately clear to me why the items in Table 2 were different from those in Table 3. Perhaps it is explained in the text but I failed to appreciate it.

I'm not sure Figure 2 and Table 4 add much and remain concerned about identifiability.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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