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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript is well written and relates to a very important but often neglected topic: patient’s and parent’s (caregiver’s) subjective perception of disease, treatment and outcome. I hope my comments will help to improve the manuscript. My general impression is that there might be more information in the data compared to how the data is currently presented.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

Introduction.

(1) The aim of the study is very generally described. Did the authors have more specific hypotheses that have been tested? If that was the case, I suggest that these are explained.

(2) In the title, the authors mention the mixed methods approach (which is a big advantage in my opinion). However, this fact is not picked up in the introduction. Maybe the authors should mention this special approach and line out its advantages.

Methods and Results.

(3) While reading, my impression was that the study might be a pure qualitative study instead of a comprehensive mixed quantitative / qualitative approach. Statistical analyses are based on the description of subthemes. Therefore, the title might be misleading. Instead of just listing and describing subthemes in the results section, the reader could benefit from e.g. statistical comparisons of certain subgroups (e.g. using the YGTSS) or from a comparison of parents’ vs. children’s opinions by combining interview statements and quantitative results.

In case my interpretation of the used term “mixed methods” is wrong, I suggest that the authors describe their understanding in the methods section.

(4) Also, a figure that shows for example positive opinions vs negative opinions might improve the manuscript and might reduce the length of the results section.

Discussion.

(5) The discussion might change in relation to my previous comments.
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