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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript reports on observations made by parents of children with cerebral palsy (GMFCS levels 4-5) and their healthcare professionals on BoNT-A treatment goals for the child. A previously defined inventory of goals categorized based on the ICF framework was used to initiate discussion on goal-setting. Parents and healthcare professionals then provided their feedback and revised the inventory from their perspectives. Importance of specific goals were estimated by counting how often it was identified across families as relevant to their child's treatment. The authors suggest the revised inventory, consolidated across families, as a tool for initiating discussion during goal setting for BoNT-A treatment.

Developing methods to improve the parent-healthcare professional partnership is very important, and improving the goal setting process is one way to improve that partnership. Below are some major and minor comments that should be addressed to strengthen the paper.

Major Comments:

1. The participants in this study (parents of children with CP) are not described in sufficient detail to understand whether their responses were related to specific participant characteristics and history. Some details of relevance may include: (1) how many parents/opinions were included for each child? (2) was BoNT-A being recommended for immediate use at the time of interview? (3) had they previously consented to BoNT-A injections for their child, and how many times? (4) what was the outcome of previous BoNT-A injections?

2. Addition of goals to the initial inventory produced by the national botulinum toxin conference seems to have been contributed by healthcare professionals involved in the study. Were they co-authors on the paper? If they were not, they should be considered as participants in the study, and more details on them should be included. Some relevant details may include the number of years they have been in practice, the type of practice they have, whether they were commenting on the specific subjects/children with CP in the study or
commenting in general based on their experience, whether they know the study subjects, and how many were included.

3. A link is not made between the inventory of treatment goals and the outcomes of BoNT-A treatment. It would be helpful to describe this either in the Background or in the "Development of the inventory goals" section of the Methods. In other words, is there evidence that the goals are realistic and match potential outcomes after treatment or are they generic goals that parents have for their child that are not specific to BoNT-A treatment?

4. Table 3 is missing.

5. To show that the inventory can be helpful during the goal setting process (which is the conclusion of the manuscript), it would be important to systematically document the initial parent responses to the open-ended question used in the study design: "What kinds of goals do you have for your child with cerebral palsy after receiving botulinum toxin treatment?" Otherwise, as the study is reported currently, it is difficult to quantify how much the inventory helped in the process. [Also, it may be useful in the future to determine the parents' perceived usefulness of the inventory, and the effects of inclusion of the inventory on a measure of the parents' perceived level of partnership between themselves and the healthcare professionals.]

Minor Comments:

1. Page 3, line 12: "range of motion of muscle limbs" can be re-worded, maybe to "joint range of motion"

2. In Table 1, it would be good to include whether, where and how frequently BoNT-A was used in the past. Also, it would be good to include the where on the body BoNT-A use was being recommended at the time of interview. This would likely influence goal setting.

3. "Participants" is used to describe the parents on page 4, line 18, but in the section on "Subjects", the word "participants" is used to describe the children with CP on page 4, line 35. It would be easier to read if "participants" always referred to the parents, and "subjects" to the children with CP.

4. Page 4, line 39: How were cognitive impairments assessed?

5. Page 5, line 40-41: The goals were not among children with CP, but among their parents.

6. Page 5, line 58: Insert ", and" after the word "child".
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