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**Background**

The rational for the Work is good and very relevant. However, there is an abundance of research on paediatric consultations that is not reviewed.

Given the age of some of their participants, much of the adult patient-provider communication literature and interventions is relevant, but this is hardly discussed.

Page 5 line 81 communication repeated and two sets of reference numbers

Page 5 line 87 adolescence repeated and two sets of reference numbers

Page 6 line 101 too many full stops and in wrong place re "practices"

**Method**

Why are aims repeated twice, and the second time they are longer and more extended, only need one set of aims and objectives.

I am not sure i could class this as a feasibility study, as there is not a defined intervention that was tested in its entirety. this is a small pilot study.

We have no information on how the data from the pre-intervention phased was actually used to inform the Development of the interventions. It is unclear what was preented to the advisory Group, what design process was used, and why use the resources and interventions they did.

why choose the exalin.me.uk website over other options, and why use the other tools they have compared to other tools available.

Page 7 line 129, individuals were given the option to not be video recorded, were they given the option not to participate at all?

When was written consent obtained from the participants.
I am unclear how data was collected on the use of the tools / intervention pre and post the consultation. Were people asked what they accessed or looked at sometime. I assume participants must have been contacted by phone sometime after the consultation, to find out if they used the tools after the consultation.

Clinicians were invited to have the website open during consultations, was it confirmed that they did actually have it open?

Why were consultations transcribed, NVIVO allows analysis direct from the audio/video recording.

Why were the transcripts marked with timings, NVIVO can be tagged and data extracted on talk time, the marking of transcripts introduces unnecessary error.

Not sure on the rational for not using semantic content to define questions, this needs clearer explanation, and what syntactical rules were used to determine a question had been asked.

Why use the PCAT, there are other tools that could be used and used more widely. We have very little information on how this tool identifies what is coded and how it is coded. Similar for OPTION, much more information is needed.

Why is information on consent in the section on analysis.

Results

12 clinicians were involved in the consultations. Is this the same clinicians in both phases of the study?

There is substantial variation on consultation times, so analysis really needs to consider this and to what extent this impacts on the measures being used, as there are far less opportunities to ask questions in a 6 minute consultation, than a 43 minute one. Would be better to have a sense of distribution of times.

What interventions were taken up when. This would seem critical to understanding the interventions, and how they might impact on Things. Yet we have no information on this.

The rest of the results is very text heavy for what it is very little information.

I am also surprised at there being no attempt to look at relationships between variables. Was MISS scores associated with consultation length, number of questions asked etc....

Discussion

Over long for the limited data presented, and the lack of effect seen.
In essence the approach to this study was good, just how it is presented needs a lot more care and thought.

**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.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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**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.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
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