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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Professor Veroniki,

Thank you for the opportunity to resubmit a revised protocol for our study; Rethinking Strategies for Positive Newborn Screening Result (NBS+) Delivery (ReSPoND): a process evaluation of co-designing interventions to minimise impact on parental emotional well-being and stress) that we would like considered for publication in BMC Pilot and Feasibility Studies. This study is funded by NIHR HS&DR https://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hsdri/165225/#/.

I confirm the revised work has been seen and approved by all co-authors. Please see a point by point response below:
Reviewer #2: The authors have put in a lot of work to incorporate my feedback from the first revision. The introduction is more suitable to a manuscript, it concisely states the topic and the issue. The methods are easier to read in the new organized feedback and I (and future readers, I'm sure) appreciate the clarity added to the methods (e.g., correcting that the qualitative analyses for phase 3 will take an inductive approach). I have included a few very minor editing comments.

Thank you so much for taking the time to review the paper again, it is very much appreciated.

Line 154, suggested wording of "in the short term and may also have long-term impact"

This has been changed

Line 361-362, this sentence structure is slightly strange when listing the inclusion criteria. I'm not sure if there is supposed to be an "and" before "inclusive diagnosis" or if it's supposed to say "inclusive of all diagnoses" or something else. Please correct.

This has been changed so it now reads, “…and children who are diagnosed as ‘Cystic Fibrosis Screen Positive, Inconclusive Diagnosis’ will be included in the study.” I think these children were previously known in the US as CRMS but I believe following an international Delphi process, it was agreed these children should be referred to as ‘cystic fibrosis screen positive, inconclusive diagnosis’ or CFSPID (doi: 10.1016/j.jcf.2015.01.001)

Line 452, please remove comma before the period.

Done

Table 1, the abbreviations can be removed from the table, since they’re only used one time in the table, with the exception of SCD and CF.

Done

Figures, inconsistent capitalization in figure legends.

These have been changed so they are now consistent
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Dr Jane Chudleigh wrote the first draft of the manuscript and attended to the reviewers comments.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

Jane Chudleigh PhD, MSc, PGDip, BSc, RN (C), SFHEA
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City, University of London
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