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Reviewer’s report:

What an interesting research project. As the authors recognise, only four interviews meant that one would have to be very cautious to draw any conclusions from the research study itself. But the results must be useful to anyone working in the same field. It is understandable that the authors have decided to get a publication from the methods employed.

The conclusion that "Working with peer-researchers throughout the interview and analysis process resulted in a more comfortable interviewee experience and brought a different perspective and emphasis into the interpretation of results. This approach has the potential to produce more client-centred recommendations for policy and service development." is very plausible, possible and even likely - but it does not seem to be proven by the paper. There were only four interviews and the authors indicate that much effort was expended on trying to recruit more to be interviewed. The numbers approached are not given but we can assume that those interviewed may not be representative. We are not told if those interviewed remembered being told as a result of the NCMP that their child was obese. So we do not know whether they were part of the cohort who gave vocalisation to their negative reaction to being told their child was obese. And neither do we know if they would have given a professional researcher different views to those trained patient/carers who interviewed them. Or that they would have been having a more comfortable interviewee experience. This seems so frustrating for the project which was embarked upon in such a well intention way.
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