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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. The objective of this study was to explore caregivers' views about an inclusive, parent-implemented early childhood program (the LiTTLe Program) for 0-3 years in an Aboriginal community health context. While the topic is timely and population of focused is valued and under researched, there are several items within the manuscript that need to be addressed for this manuscript to be considered acceptable for publication.

Overall

1. Editing of the manuscript is needed for grammar, clarity, and consistent use of short forms. OM should be defined the first time it is used and then abbreviated thereafter.

2. More consistent use of referencing is needed throughout the manuscript (e.g. page 7, lines 14-25 are not cited).

Background

3. The background section should be reworked and be made more succinct. Currently the background section is does not flow logically, but instead should start with normal development of speech, the impact that OM is proposed to have generally, then move onto the prevalence and population of interest.

4. Cite where the background information was obtained that is provided on the LiTTLe program. Why was the program discontinued? Please explain for context.

5. Page 8, line 39 onward should be moved under the subheading of 'Aim'.

6. Regarding the study aim, please broadening beyond a summary of the phenomenon to include insights for future development program or potential transferability to other
populations/settings. A qualitative study should be more than just a description/evaluation of a program. If a description of the program is all that is of interest, please revise the manuscript to be a program evaluation using qualitative methods.

7. For Page 8, lines 44 to Page 10, line 10, please revise to state as objectives, rather than areas of focus to be consistent with qualitative methodology.

Participants

8. Further clarification is requested on recruitment and participants involved. How were participants recruited? What was the rate of declined participation, if any? Was there any difference between parents who participated and those who declined/were not involved?

9. More information is requested on the demographics of the participants. Please provide details on age, sex, occupation, etc. and incorporate page 11, lines 5-27. Consider reporting the demographic data in tables to facilitate easier understanding and to improve flow.

10. For information reported on frequency of program use, report percentages as well as total n for clarity.

Interview Methods

11. For the semi-structured interview questions, provision of semi-structure interview guide as supplementary material is strongly suggested as an Appendix.

12. Please describe where the interviews took place (e.g., at the participants' home, at the school, etc.) and the role of the translator. How many interviews were conducted through a translator and what was the process used for transcription?

Data Analysis

13. Further describing the data coding process is needed, including whether codes were derived inductively or deductively. How were themes identified from the data? How did you determine reliability of themes? As it stands right now, the themes seem to be the areas of focus as previously stated, rather than themes that emerged from the interviews.

14. How many coders were used? Was any software used? Was any triangulation or validation of findings used? Please clarify to provide credibility of findings.
15. Was there any underlying theory or conceptual framework used? If so, this should be included in your methodology.

16. Page 13, lines 22-30 is unclear. Please revise to clarify how you are using frequency in your reporting and on what specific items, moving Page 13, lines 41-26 here. What is the minimum and maximum rating available?

Results

17. Revised Page 13, lines 41-Page 14 line 3 based on feedback provided in item #16.

18. Page 14, lines 26-34 and Page 16, lines 12 to 27 should be in methods, not results. Please revise.

19. Considerable revision of the results section is needed based on the previous comments around theme development and aim of study. As currently formatted, the results seem to be a summary per question instead of a true qualitative analysis. Please revise.

20. The inclusion of quotes is essential, however short quotes should be incorporated into a paragraph rather than as a standalone quote.

Discussion

21. Discussion is currently a summary of results. Please consider how your findings are related to, builds on or differs from previous literature.

22. Consistent with qualitative research, please reflect on positionality in relation to the research and how it may have influenced the interpretation of the results.

23. Consideration of the study finding’s relevance to future programs is suggested.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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