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Reviewer's report:
This is a good study of an important aspect of prenatal screening for cardiac defects. The methods used are qualitative and adequate for the purpose. The paper is well written. I only have a two comments and they both refer to the paragraph below:

"To be eligible, participants needed to speak Swedish well enough to be interviewed and be presented with a prenatal diagnosis of a congenital heart defect in the fetus carried by their partner, diagnosed before 22 completed weeks of gestation. Here we define major congenital heart defect as in need of surgical repair within the child's first year of life. During the inclusion period, 24 expectant fathers presented with a prenatal diagnosis were consulted at the centers. Of these, 20 consented to be contacted via telephone by the first author 5-15 weeks after the diagnosis. Four were not reached via telephone and four declined participation when contacted. Consequently, the final sample consisted of 12 respondents."

Comments:
1. it should read: .....diagnosis of a major congenital.....
2. 24 were eligible but only 12 participated. Although that should not be a major problem in qualitative research I think it would be appropriate to mention why this is so in the limitation section and also shortly describe in the discussion those 12 fathers which were not interviewed. Were they in any way different from those who were interviewed, was the distribution of fetal cardiac diagnoses and gestational age at diagnosis similar? Was the proportion choosing termination of pregnancy similar?
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.
No

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:
Acceptable
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