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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript will be of interest to others who are implementing MITS in the context of a research study or clinical care, and particularly in populations that are predominately Muslim.

Please address the following with respect to content of the manuscript:

1) Can you report any information about education or SES of parents participating in the FGDs (or even general demographics of the study population from which you pulled ie those who visit well-baby clinics of NICH hospital)? This is directly relevant to what you report, particularly with respect to parent comments related to MITS being more acceptable amongst those who are more educated. It is impossible for the reader to understand whether your sample disproportionately represented those who are more educated or of higher SES, and thus demonstrated higher acceptability to MITS than might be found in the general population.

2) Please add a paragraph to the discussion describing how the findings of this study may have influenced the manner in which consent was obtained for PURPose, e.g., who was approached for consent, the manner in which MITS was described, whether a religious leader was available for questions etc.

3) Consider whether "fear of unexpected medical findings" should be analyzed under factors affecting implementation of MITS. This seems more in line with those affecting acceptance of the procedure.

4) 152: It is stated that there were 4 to 6 participants per FDG; Table 1 states there were 5 per group.

5) 159: It is stated that FGDs and KIIs were coded as one data set; however, the information in the results sections splits the content by FDGs vs KIIs. Please explain (i.e., were there no common themes that overlapped between the FGDs and KIIs?)

6) 177: It is ambiguous whether n=8 is referring to parents or number of FDGs until you get to Table 1. Please clarify in this sentence.

7) Table 2: religious and cultural perspective, desire to bury the body as soon as possible--this is not addressed in the results of the manuscript.
Please review the following lines for language corrections:

8) 105-107: sentence is missing an "and" after "CDA"

9) 187: precious=previous

10) 195: This sentence does not add any new thought compared to the one prior to it ("Parents widely recognized..."). Suggest deleting.

11) 230: general=general

12) 389-390: End of sentence is missing a word--acceptability OF MITS.

13) 405-407: Run-on sentence

14) 408-409: Please review grammar for this sentence.

15) Table 2, acceptability of MITS, precious=previous
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