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Reviewer's report:
Review of "Health Professionals Perceptions Regarding Surveillance Tools…"

This is an important study of how health care providers value and understand the developmental instruments they are required to use. Some improvements are needed:

Background/Introduction
Page 4, lines 22 - 29, it is not clear why, in a paper devoted to health professionals, the comment about attendance at early childhood centers if relevant.

Page 5, lines 12- 14, The ASQ Tools and PEDS Tools are designed for parents who may not know much about child development and both have been proven to identify problems regardless of parents' educational background (and parenting skills). So this comment is both irrelevant to the topic of the paper and incorrect. Also, one of the goals of PEDS is to identify parenting issues related to lack of child-rearing knowledge so that clinicians can offer developmental promotion and parenting guidance (e.g., in response to concerns such as, "I don't know what a 2-year-old should be able to say.").

Page 5, ~ line 29, did the authors mean "use and utility"?

Background Overall: the background section should focus more on what is already known about providers' use of standardized measures including whether referrals are made when indicated, knowledge of resources and parent education materials.
The description of the measures used should be moved to the Methods section and include more detail about how each tool works. A table might be an efficient way to illustrate differences in instruments.

Methods
This section is clear, but probably too long. I'd be tempted to reduce or eliminate the philosophy of qualitative research (first two paragraphs). NVivo software needs a reference re: publisher, URL, etc.

Results
The first two paragraphs need rewriting for better clarity and jargon reduction (e.g., "attendance at surveillance services" - does that mean in-service training for professionals? Parents not bringing children for care?). One possibility might be to simply list the thematic categories extracted since each of these is much better explained in following paragraphs. Table 3 might be inserted somewhere later in the results section.

Discussion
This manuscript has many implications for practice and so practice recommendations should be listed at the end of the paper. Action plans addressing issues such as these need to be devised:

Clinicians seem ill-trained in use of tools and/or in need updated training;

Clinicians need a better understanding of parents' perception (e.g., birth order is not known to make a difference in parents willingness to raise concerns. Parents' "denial" is most often guardedness (e.g., "I didn't want to mention my concerns because I wasn't sure they were correct. If there was a problem, my GP would notice and tell me."

Does the "Blue Book" have scoring guidance and Interpretation of results?;

Have trainers customized recommendations for next steps with NSW services and ensured that clinicians know about existing translations (and where to find telephone interpretation services)?;
Do health care professionals have techniques for encouraging parents to attend well-visits?

Do parents understand that well-visits are "not just about shots"?

Are GPs coordinating with home visiting nurses and is cross-service collaboration needed?

Are clinicians aware that PEDS is best used routinely with PEDS:Developmental Milestones (so that providers can obtain swiftly needed information on developmental status and thus whether parenting guidance is needed versus referrals)?
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