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Author’s response to reviews:

Paramala Santosh
Editor
BMC Pediatrics

Dear Dr Santosh,

Thank you very much for organising the third round reviews for our paper. Below is a point-by-point detailed summary of how we have responded to the reviews.
With thanks

Caroline Jones

--

Reviewer reports:

Justine Dol (Reviewer 1): Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript again. It is clear that the authors have taken into serious consideration previous feedback, however, a few minor revisions are suggested:

- In the abstract & methods section, please clarify which qualitative methodology was used to analyzed the data (page 2, line 32 and page 10, lines 24-47).

- In the Abstract (Methods) and in the Method sections we have now clarified that we used thematic analysis (p. 10, Data Analysis, end of paragraph).

- Substantial copy editing is required. For example, in the results section, quotes under 40 words should be incorporated into the paragraph, not pulled out. Also, the sentence in brackets on page 16, lines 34-41 should be put as a footnote under the table, rather than in the text. Please review full manuscript for similar issues.

- We would like to respectfully ask if this is necessary. Before submitting we had checked our style against other qualitative reports in your journal (e.g. Shields & Synnot, 2016) where all quotes (of similar length to ours) are not incorporated into the paragraph. With respect to page 16, lines 34-41, we have avoided footnotes in general, in line with the guidelines for authors. The note at this point about Table 3 is already in parentheses to make its status clear. We are willing to make this change if it is required but it seems to us that it will introduce clutter and not assist with readability.

- While it is clear that the authors removed some repetition throughout the manuscript as requested, certain areas are still repetitive and unnecessary. For instance, on page 18, lines 36 to 54, the authors again repeat what the questions were asking, rather than summarizing what the findings were. This occurs throughout the results section. Please revise to minimize the wordiness and length of the manuscript.
- The specific location mentioned on p 18 has been fixed by eliminating the relevant sentence from that paragraph. We have taken the comments seriously and reduced wordiness and length at 9 other locations in the Results section:

Overall views, 2nd paragraph, 2 edits here.

Views about hearing health and intervention, 2nd paragraph rewritten, 4th paragraph edited, 7th paragraph edited.

Views about school readiness, 4th paragraph edited, 5th paragraph edited, 6th paragraph edited.

Views about implementation, 2nd paragraph edited.

- While the authors did attempt to open the discussion with a summary of the results, they unfortunately did not address the concerns as specific. For example, page 27, lines 12-22 is not a summary of results but of methods and should be removed. Also, while the headings are an improvement, each section should lead with the findings followed by their implication and relevance to existing literature, which is lacking. For example, on page 29, lines 1-15, this should be directly under the heading as this is a clear summarization of the findings while page 28, lines 15 to 23 should be removed, as again, it is just a description of the program that has been stated elsewhere. Considerable work is still needed on the discussion including how your findings are related to, builds on or differs from previous literature as well as relevance to future programs.

- The specific changes requested at page 27, 28, 29 have been made. We have also reworked the Discussion section so that under each subheading it now flows more from results into implications as requested. We have also improved the Discussion section by placing more general comments first. We have added two new references and use these to contextualise our work and discuss its significance and contribution to the literature.

Âse Boman, Ph.D (Reviewer 2): Dear Authors,

- Thank you for the opportunity to review the second re-submission of this manuscript. My overall opinion is that the manuscript have satisfactory improved, and that my comments have been obeyed. Still, I have a few comments. The section Background in your Abstract would be more consistent if you lift up the sentence "The LiTTLe Prrogram...." before you address the aim of your study.

- This has been fixed, thank you for this point.
On page 10 you describe three answering alternatives, all positive and not allowing for a negative answer (like if the foci had not been promoted), I think this should be discussed in the Limitations section.

- We have now included that point in the Limitations section, thank you for this.

The Limitations section would also be strengthened if you supported your statements with references.

- Two references have been added to support the statements in the Limitations.

Finally, I also miss a reference on page 28 line 7, at the end of the sentence that ends with ”, but research from other languages suggest.....”

- We have now added a reference at this point, thank you.

Antony Simon Opwora, MPH (Reviewer 3): Thank you for the opportunity to review this re-submission.

Title: A program to respond to otitis media in remote Australian Aboriginal communities: a qualitative investigation of parent perspectives

Authors: Caroline Jones, Mridula Sharma, Samantha Harkus, Catherine McMahon, Mele Taumoepeau, Katherine Demuth, Karen Mattock, Lee Rosas, Raelene Wing, Sulabha Pawar and Anne Hampshire.

I thank Caroline Jones et al for the great effort they put into revising this manuscript. I have enjoyed reading it and believe that it will be ready for publication pending a few discretionary revisions outlined below and the editorial office's approval.

Background: This flows very well after revising according to previous suggestions.

1. In the first paragraph, it may be worthy mentioning the proportion of the population that forms the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities in Australia. This may help put into perspective the origin of the debate mentioned in paragraph 2 regarding the public health burden of otitis media.

- This has been added to the end of the first paragraph, thank you for the suggestion.
Methods:

2. Kindly indicate the type of informed consent that interviewees provided, i.e. verbal or written.
   - This has now been added under Participants, first paragraph in the Methods section.

3. Kindly indicate the version number or year or trademark label for the NVivo program used to organize your data.
   - We have included the version number 11.1.1 under Data analysis within the Method section.

Discussion: Good introduction, however:

4. These statements "All participating adults, at no time had worked for the LiTTLe Program. All participants were assured confidentiality" should be moved to methods section or deleted completely from this section.
   - This has been moved to the Methods section.

5. Although the statement "It was evident that in some cases parents chose to participate because they wanted to provide views that were critical of the LiTTLe Program or its implementation" sounds good, it does not seem to fit well at this point where it sounds suspect.
   - We have now removed it from the paper.

6. Views on speech and language strategies: the use of the words "throws into relief" in the first statement of this sub-section is confusing or inappropriate.
   - We have reworded this to say "highlights" instead. 