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Reviewer's report:

Summary: This is a study 1) validating a questionnaire assessing sociodemographic variables for research on family caregivers of children with chronic disease; 2) assessing relationship between these sociodemographic variables and psychosocial care. Aim #1 was adequately fulfilled, however, Aim #2 still requires additional work and clarification.

Introduction

The knowledge gap that this study fills should be clarified. What is the relevance of this information to Spanish-speaking or Mexican population? What is the relevance beyond those populations? While the reader can decide some of this based upon the methods and results, it would be helpful for the authors to outline the field as a whole and then any particular knowledge gaps that might exist for Spanish-speaking population (e.g., no similar measures validated in Spanish) and/or individuals who operate within Mexico (perhaps a brief description of the systems that social workers, caregivers and their children work within). Please help the reader contextualize this study.

I suggest different organization:

Introduction

Study 1: Describe Methods and present Results,

Study 2: Describe Methods and present Results

Discussion

Methods

Study 1:
- Please provide additional details on participant recruitment: How many reviewers were invited? How were they contacted? What was the participation rate? Was there any compensation for participation?

- Provide additional details on procedure - were they mailed the survey? Was this done in person? What language was it delivered in? Etc.

- Provide some information on how items were scored - for example: on a scale of 1 to 5, or yes/no, etc.

Study 2:

- Again please provide additional details on how participants were recruited: How were they identified and contact? How many invited? What was the participation rate? Other details, such as compensation, language, etc.

Results

- The reported results are all bi-variate. While the analyses presented in Table 3 are interesting, I think it would be more informative to create and present multivariate models, so that the reader can learn something about which variables are most important (as they all relate to one another). Bi-variate analyses are often sufficient when the only goal is to validate a measure, but if you would like to present results based on a measure, we should see some multivariate modeling.

Table 2:

Provide additional information on what the %'s represent - are these % agreement? Are they % who said the items was: relevant, had utility, etc? (see comment in Methods for study 1)

Table 3:

This is difficult to read. I'm not sure if the authors are making comparisons between caregiver characteristics and psychosocial variables for the patient? Or the caregiver? If both, they should be presented separately. Also, rather than presenting the F-statistic and p-value for each psychosocial variable and characteristic relationship, it might be more helpful to present the mean (s.d.) and overall p-value for differences (and pair-wise comparisons when relevant)

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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