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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes, questions and hypothesis are stated clearly.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   I have some concerns regarding translating the measures that is nothing was reported about the validity and reliability of the translated measures.

3. Are the data sound?
   The number of participants in the OR group is off by 1. The total number of participants should be 23 not 24.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes it is. I suggest consulting a statistician, the choice of the statistical tests are sound and appropriate. However, the results reported need to be checked.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Discussion section needs more integration of the findings and lacks the implication to practice. Authors are not discussing in details, how their findings can be translated in the community provided the limited resources.
   In some parts of the discussion the authors jump to conclusions that are not supported by their data. In writing, I think the authors can do better job in distinguishing between their biases and what to do they think the reasons of their finding and what the results are telling us. E.g. paragraph 3.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   The authors did not discuss the fact that the children in both settings were receiving therapy. Hence, could the results they observed in parents and children outcomes be due to type of therapy the children were receiving in the community based setting? I think this point is important, and that the authors need to control for this confounding factor. Otherwise they might be misrepresenting the findings.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building both published and unpublished? Yes.
7. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Title conveys content of the study, however, the abstract is long and provide distracting information, I think the authors can integrate the abstract and present it in more coherent way. E.g. the introduction can focus on why the study is important instead of discussing CP.

8. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes. There are some sentences that need to be rephrased and some typos. I highlighted these in the attached text. You can see my comments and when sentences are highlighted this mean that I found them hard to follow or to understand.

The authors refer to the community based intervention by different terminology such as institution based, I recommend that authors need to be consistent in their terminology