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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

Thank you for the opportunity to read your manuscript. The topic is very interesting but I think you need to address and clarify parts of the text

Background

p. 7-8. Here you present the LiTTLe program, but it is not specifically precise, as a reader not familiar with the program I would like to know more about it. You present more details later in the Result section. I suggest you make a full presentation of the program in the background and skip it in the Result. Furthermore, I miss the scientific basis for the LiTTLe program. Is it based on research? What are the scientific proofs for its effects?

p. 8-9. The section after the Aim from line 51 starting with "Theses are of particular…." to Methods on p. 10 should be divided by content and moved to before the aim. A lot of the information is repetitions and the parts that is new should be presented to the reader before the aim

Methods

p.11 line 34 Please be more exact when describing the mothers age. And where can I found information about the grandparent?

p.11 line 35 I think the label should start with Otitis Media….and not Hearing …. 

p.12 line 5 What is ENT?

p.12 line 32 Took all interviews exactly 45 minutes? Do you mean that the average time of the interviews were 45 minutes? In your Result section you repeatedly present new
questions you asked the participants, these questions should all be presented in the Method section and be deleted from the Result.

p.13. line 2-30. First, you repeat information about the interview. Second, you description of how you performed your analysis need to be clarified and extended. On line 10 you used the concept code, I should say it is more of sorted material than code. You also blend data collection and data analysis in the same section.

Results

Overall your result is very wordy and sometimes inadequate to your aim. It needs to be more structured and abstracted. Please sort and categorize your result. I think the Result section should benefit from a Figure or Table as an overview. You also blend program and interview data in the result which more properly should be presented in the background and the methodology section. Please, control for repetitions, there are several in the section

p.13 line 41-51 Method information
p14. Line 26-35 To Methods
p15. Line 51-59 Please clarify, I do not understand what you mean
p.17 line 12-25; 49-51 You have mixed methods and results
p18. Line 31-41 To Background
p.21. line 10 …less cultural familiar….I don't understand were this came from… Your result?
p.22 line 9-15 To Background
p.22 line 19-27 To Methods
p22. Line 37-39 To Methods
p.23 line 5 - p26. line 5 This section does not answer to your aim, it is interesting but not adequate to the purpose of the study
p.27 line 49-51 To Background
p.30 line 17-34 In the section below I demonstrate how you can decrease the words and become more precise.

Text in manuscript: "We were interested also to find out about the community's engagement with the program: whether parents recommended the program to a friend or relative, what reasons
they had for sometimes not attending, why or when the parents stopped going to the program, and any suggestions they had for the future were a similar program to be initiated in the community. Several of the parents reported having recommended the program to a friend or relative e.g. other parents, friends, sister and cousin. Those Parents tended to reply in the same breath that for some reason the others had n’t not come along. One child was reported as trying to encourage her uncle to attend the program."(Funny, but not adequate)

Suggested text: Several of the parents reported having recommended the program to a friend or relative. The parents pointed out that for some reason the others had not come along.

p.31 line 3 I think "admitted" is to judge the mom
p.31 30-44 Partly repetitions

Discussion
You do not discuss your main findings and the discussion is unbalanced in relation to the wordy result
p.32 line 53 - p.33 line 12 Inadequate to your aim
p.33 line 27-47 Inadequate to your aim
p.34 line 1-17 Repetitions of the results
p.34 line 34-44 This is certainties and not a discussion on strengths and limitations of the actual study
p.35 You should not use references in your Conclusion, instead they should be more frequent and varying in your Discussion

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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