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Reviewer's report:

General comments:

The paper is a discussion of the potential application of self-determination theory (SDT) on enhancing pediatric hemophilia patients' adherence to self-care. The topic is important and interesting in the field. I believe SDT will shown great promises in this context. However, problems of logical presentation and clarity, and minor language errors present throughout the manuscript. The theoretical background of SDT is not described precisely and correctly. Some special terms used in the manuscript, such as non-autonomous motivation, major needs, self-motivation, do not appear to be in accordance to SDT or its related research. The proposed strategies based on SDT are not properly cited or they do not appear to be derived from the tenet of SDT. The authors should strengthen the theoretical background of SDT, and logically present the concept of SDTs and its constructs before making elaboration of how they could be applied in the pediatric hemophilia.

Specific comments:

Abstract Par1 Line 1-2: Who's “adherence and selfcare”?

Abstract Par1 Line 2: “both” seems redundant.

Abstract Par 1 Line 3: “Adherence rates” of who and of what? This unclear phrase appears throughout the manuscript.

Abstract Par 3 Line 4-5: “adherence in the developing child”, what does it mean?

P4 Line 2: adherence rate of what? Adherence is not meaningful to all behaviours, and its rate may vary a lot from one behavior to another.

P4 line 15-16: “as a child starts self administering factor infusion during early adolescence”, this phrase is difficult to be understood, and sound problematic.

P4 line 15: “Adherence to prophylaxis regimens” reads quite confusing to me as a reader who had no prior knowledge about how prophylaxis regimen are related to the topic of interest.

P4 Line 16: “90% of children” who are patients of what?? I think same issue appears throughout the manuscript. It should be clarified.
P4 Line 20: “when confronted to a bleed” sound confusing to me again. Readers have no clue about what it means.

P4 Line 25: “factor prophylaxis”, what does it mean?

P5 Line 27-32: The statements do not read very logical and derived based on evidence. Also, the authors should explain how they are linked to the topic of discussion in the paper.


P6 Line 51: Does “while parental supervision progressively decreases.”? Perhaps a citation would help strengthen this argument.

P6 Line 51-57: The terms from SDT (e.g., motivation, autonomous motivation) just arise without explanation. Perhaps their definitions need to come first before they are mentioned.

P6 Line 58-59: Autonomous motivation is a concept from SDT, so this sentence sounds quite awkward.

P6 Line 59-60: “they are at the center of their actions” do not appear to be the AIM of SDT.

P6 Line 62-63: What is “non-autonomous motivation”? As far as I know, SDT does not have this term or construct. I think the authors refer to controlled motivation.

P7 Line 81: What is autonomy support? How it is defined under SDT, and how it is related to autonomous motivation?

P7 line 85: “major needs” a term from SDT? I believe the author refer to basic psychological needs. Again, we need more solid theoretical explanation before it can be discussed and be applied in this manuscript.

P7 Line 85-97: Some of the autonomy supportive strategies proposed do not appear to be in line with SDT or research based on SDT, please provide citations or more elaborations.

P7 Line 87: “When the child is ill” sounds weird. Who is THE child?

P8 line 108: “Multiple, complex behaviors are necessary for appropriate self-care.”, where does this statement derive from?
Table 1 line 2: Use “children” or “his/her feelings”.

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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