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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review a revised version of the 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 health care professionals". The authors were very responsive to my and the other reviewers comments. I have only a few minor suggestions moving forward, all of my other comments were adequately addressed:

* Page 4: It is not clear why the authors sought to review these programs in the first place. There needs to be some context - what necessitates a review of the interventions designed to support parents of children with cancer?

* Page 5: Based on what criteria did the authors decide to 'retain' the two programs? It is also not clear for what the authors retained these programs.

* Page 5: Combining programs - how did you decide what to include? How do you know what you selected produces an effect on the desired outcome? How do you know that what you picked does not have an iatrogenic effect when combined?

* Page 5: Did you have any buy-in/support from the original program developers?

* Reference 22 is old and reflects older thinking regarding MOST. Strongly suggest the 2018 Collins book as a replacement for this reference.
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