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Author’s response to reviews:

Montreal, 13th January 2019
Dr Gillian Lancaster
Editor-in-Chief
Pilot and Feasibility Studies
Dear Dr. Lancaster,

Thank you for reviewing the revised version of our manuscript entitled, "Definition and improvement of the concept and tools of a psychosocial intervention program for parents in pediatric oncology: A mixed-methods study conducted with parents and healthcare professionals", which was submitted in consideration for publication in Pilot and Feasibility Studies (PAFS-D-18-00117R2). We would like to extend our sincere gratitude to the reviewers who examined our manuscript in depth. The reviewers’ suggestions and comments have been taken into consideration and we modified the manuscript accordingly. We hope that you will find this revised manuscript suitable for publication in your journal. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

David Ogez, Ph.D.

Reviewer #1: I think the authors have been quite responsive to my comments.

1- There are a few grammatical errors that need addressing throughout the manuscript - please check thoroughly.

Response: Following your advice, we carefully reviewed the manuscript. A complete revision of this manuscript was also conducted by an Anglophone to correct grammatical errors. Please see track changes of the attached document.

2- There are a few minor clarifications to address which should be quick to address as follows:

   a. Please add 'pilot' or 'feasibility' to the title after 'mixed methods'.

   Response: In accordance with your comment, we added the term "feasibility" to our title. Although this article aims to redefine the design of an intervention program, it focuses on an assessment of its feasibility by healthcare professionals and parents.

   b. Please make clear what the summaries in brackets mean in the results section, eg p.13 line 322 (M=3,8/5,...) - is this (Mean=3, what does 8/5 stand for?)
Response: We replaced the commas with periods to facilitate the understanding of these averages (see lines 281-282, 412-414, 450, 459-460, 472-473, 484-485). The scores are out of a total of 5. Information regarding the total of these items is noted in the material section. To facilitate the understanding of these averages, we added details on the presentation of our quantitative results in the analyses section.

Line 282: “Quantitative results relate to the average scores of the main topics assessed by questionnaires (total score for each item is 5).”

c. Similarly for Table 1 it is not clear what the numbers mean eg 1,3 (with total score out of 5 - why are some scores >5?).

Response: In accordance with the previous comment, we replaced the commas with periods to facilitate the understanding of these averages in Table 1. In the title of this table, we also specified that the total of each item is 5.

d. Please put single quotes around the questionnaire item text given in brackets on page 10, lines 239-246.

Response: In agreement with your comment, we added the single quotes in this section of our manuscript (lines 248-266).