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Reviewer's report:

This is an important topic and using interpretive description is a well defended and appropriate framework by which to undertake the study. Overall, the research is presented in a fluent easy-to-read language building up the argument. Findings are very relevant both to clinicians and a political agenda about workload and consequences.

There are a number of places where further explanation is required.

It is difficult to tell whether you are talking about CAN in general, which you make a case for, but then go on very clearly to be focusing only on CSA. This we know has a different aetiology and effects. Although you mentioned neglect you didn't discuss much either. The focus could be clearer.

How does the aim go from "address an understanding of professionals experiences" to identifying facilitators in findings? Sure there is a logic but please explain this. Do the workers experience facilitators?

The "minefield" term is not explored, determined or explained. I would like this to be related to the specific data. The term "learning" seems like the experiences comes from recent graduated workers. Could another term be more suitable to reflect perspectives from both new and experienced workers?

I was confused about the clinical sample. Why were there no mental health nurses in the CAMHS team? Unless Norway is very different, it would be very surprising for these not to be a large section of the team. Moreover, CSA is often revealed to a range of people, including midwives where the perinatal care period can trigger abuse memories and reactions; emergency departments; gynae wards; medically unexplained symptoms, and increasingly is been recognised in dental care. Drug and alcohol services and family practitioners would also be well placed. So I am afraid I really don't see the rationale for this very narrow sample.

Was there really no one who refused to participate or did the leaders only ask those workers who were expected so say yes to participation? I would delete the last sentence, line 20.

Why not focus groups or a second round of interviews to get the staff reflecting on themes?
Could the interview guide be limited by the preunderstanding that this is always a minefield? Is that the experience of these participants?

Although four interviews were transcribed verbatim, I was confused by the statement that professional transcribers used a coding scheme. Does this mean they did the analysis? How did that work? Were there really no new codings at the last 15 transcriptions/interviews - or were they limited by the coding scheme built on the first four interviews? (line 17)

Moreover, you state that the research questions came from the analysis. Surely the research process has a research question first? (you stated an aim, the research question should also be there). The ID framework has quite a "loose" structure. I would like examples of the coding that was conducted before the analysis. This is especially interesting because the same themes was present at all 19 interviews (p.7) In terms of your themes, is this article also about professionalism? Is there an updated reference to the number referred to (line 20)?

Excellent discussion. However, I am afraid if this "minefield" is a limitation and preunderstanding that might not always be present in clinicians' perspective. The researchers might be limited in this understanding in both the interview guide and the title. I would appreciate a more reflective or critical appraisal of this view.
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