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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper that addresses a novel and timely research issue. On the whole the aims are clearly expressed for a reader unfamiliar with Normalization Process Theory. Although the results are reported under research question headings, these are not clearly defined earlier in the paper. The methods are appropriate and well described in the main. Data appear to be sound and well controlled. The manuscript appears to adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition. The discussion and conclusions are brought together well within the clinical context of a complex intervention and a relatively limited research evidence base. They are well balanced and appear to be adequately supported by the data. The abstract accurately conveys what has been found (see below re. research questions). On the whole this is a very well written paper.

- Major Compulsory Revisions
  None

- Minor Essential Revisions
  1. The paper would benefit from a detailed description of methods used for conducting the literature search.
  2. Likewise, the paper would benefit from a detailed description of the methods used to search the papers for evidence to test the two propositions.

- Discretionary Revisions
  3. The paper may benefit from an outline of the questions or propositions tested earlier in the abstract and introduction.
  4. The title may not be particularly meaningful to those interested in parent and practitioner perspectives on speech and language therapy intervention but unfamiliar with Normalization Process Theory.
  5. It may improve clarity to be consistent with use of ‘endogenous/exogenous’ or ‘internal/external’ in the introduction and methods.
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