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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

No - there are major issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are major issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are minor issues

Statistics - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: My overall impression of this study is that it presents some interesting themes derived from interviews of Mindful parenting program facilitators. It has the potential to connect this qualitatively derived "model" of the processes of change in these programs to the conceptual models that have been guiding the creation of these programs.

There are several worthy things that I think the authors have done well. I like that the authors connect the ideas of Mindful parenting to other critical theoretical approaches strongly connected to parenting (attachment). I like that the authors valued the perspectives of the facilitators and that the facilitators provided insights about their views of how these programs are changing parents.

My thoughts about how it might not meet best practices include:

* Fuller Description of the methods:
  o Describing their purposive sampling of 4 facilitators. Why 4, why were these programs chosen?
  o What were some exemplar questions from the semi-structured interview- good that authors were consistent across the 4 facilitators , but the essence of the FINDINGS are that they are elicited from SPECIFIC QUESTIONS. To fully evaluate the quality of the study, we need to know the quality of the questions.
  o Authors could explain the data analysis more completely - for example, HOW were notes transformed in to themes. How were these reduced into higher order themes? It would be useful to have a table illustrating this - or a figure illustrating the process/method that was used. Authors note Figure 2, but there was not one in my version.

* Unclear why the paper focuses on the processes of somatic, emotional and social learning - ostensibly 3 of the 6 themes?

* Themes don't always hold together in terms of broad GROUP processes - social learning - and processes that might be more specific to mindful parenting groups -
* The Anchor - the final conceptual model - needs to be described more fully and clearly connected back to the themes. Why anchor?

* Authors can connect to other theoretical models of Mindful Parenting Processes

* Some minor typos - but in prominent spots.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Accurate

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

The language is somewhat abstract (psychodynamic perhaps) which may be interesting, but require a fuller explanation.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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.

No

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

No

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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