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Reviewer's report:

Revision #1

I have enjoyed reading the revised manuscript and Background, Discussion and Conclusion have very much improved. Still some adjustments need to be done, especially in the Method and Result section. See my suggestions below.

Key words should appear in alphabetic order

p. 9 line 27-59 I think this information should be moved to the Background, and precede the Aim

p. 10 line 5 - 44 Benefits by being moved to the background, as it is structured now, you present the purpose and then explain the background to the aim, do it vice versa

p. 11 line 45 Delete the estimated approximately time duration for the interviews, you adress the average time in the next section

p. 14 Table legend: I still do not think this table illuminates "hearing history" but instead medical ear problems. To me hearing history is more of the child's ability to hear (which of course depends on the medical diagnoses). I emphasize the table needs to be re-named

p. 15 line 19 You still do not have explained the abbreviation ENT

p. 15-16 I think table 2 could improve by clarify that the numbers corresponds to n (the number of participants). I also think your scale is a little bit "unscientific"; exactly what is the difference between "a bit", "some", and "a lot"??

p. 16 line 23 Parents' responses ranged from "really good", "good", "interesting" to "all right". Was this fixed answer options or was it spontaneous response from the participants? What about neutral and negative outcomes?

p. 17 line 44 Please remove "interesting", the term is evalutative

p. 23 line 22 Please remove "interesting", the term is evalutative

p. 25 - 26 line 56 - 7 This section belong to the Limitations in the Discussion
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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:

Acceptable
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