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Reviewer’s report:

This is the protocol for a randomized controlled trial. As the trial is already at recruitment stage (started in 2013; first inclusions in 02/2014; results expected in the beginning 2016), it is not possible for authors to change the core elements of design or analysis. My main comments are related to study outcomes. Indeed, measures are adequately described but not which measures will be compared and how (change from baseline, final score…).

I’m surprised by the emphasis on within group comparisons, which seem rather weak given that the authors perform an RCT.

Major compulsory revisions

Outcomes: it is not clear what the primary outcome of the study is. It is never stated in the outcome, sample size calculation, nor data analysis sections. I would recommend the authors to state a single primary outcome, on which sample size was calculated (I believe it would be parental sensitivity, but it is unclear).

It is unclear what authors will compare. Measures are adequately described, but not what comparisons are planned and using which measurements (change from pretest to post test between arms? comparison of values after each assessment? Will results be described as proportions?) and using which assessments?

Minor revisions

Study population = the sentence relating to coaches and VIPP-V intervention workers relate more to procedures to standardization of the intervention.

I’m not sure about the sentence regarding participation of parents with auditory or visual disability themselves: are their children excluded from the study (which should be clearly stated) or are they included (but what is an “extra case”)?

Discretionary revisions

It would be easier for readers if intervention & outcomes were described earlier (maybe before procedure): indeed, in the procedure paragraph, there are references to the intervention or measures which are described afterwards.

Procedure = Should the sentences related to randomization be in the randomization section?
Interventions are well described in the protocol. Assessment of fidelity to what was planned should be described in the intervention section, rather than in a separate paragraph (treatment integrity) at the end of the protocol.

Secondary outcome - I feel that the secondary outcome presented is more of an “additional results concerning feasibility”.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests