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Reviewer's report:

I think this is an interesting well written paper but would like the authors to respond to the following points before it is accepted for publication.

Abstract

line 52: typo. Should be than rather than 'then'

Keywords: I think the authors should indicate this is a qualitative paper. Perhaps they should match their keywords to MESH terms.

Methods:

I would like to know how representative the recruited clinic is of other developmental clinics.

I would like to know who did the interviews and analysis, what training they had had in qualitative methods and what relationship they had to interviewees (and how this might of affected the data gathered)

It says interviews were conducted twice but I am not sure what is meant by that. Were all interviewees interviewed at baseline and 12 months later? If so, what was the focus and purpose of the first and second interviews, were they conducted by the same researcher, did the topic guides differ.

I am not convinced IPA was used. It seems more like a thematic analysis to me. I would like more detail on how data were analysed
I would also like more detail about how carers were informed about the study, recruited and sampled.

Findings

I am not sure why there are quotes in the later part of the results but not earlier on.

General point

there are quite a lot of subheadings in the text. These can be helpful but in some places break up the text. Are they all necessary?

This feels a very focused study - one setting, one population. I would like some reflection in the discussion about how applicable the findings might be to other carers of children with disabilities.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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