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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

Thank you for resubmitting your paper. This revised version of the paper is an improvement on the earlier version, and many of the comments have been dealt with. However, I found that some of the issues still remain and that the structure of the paper could be improved a bit.

In my earlier review, I commented that the paper seemed to have two objectives and while the revised version was much clearer in its objective, it still has elements of this structure. Now that the evaluation has been taken out of the title and focus is on the development of the tool, the material about the forthcoming project should, in my opinion, be placed after the discussion and the limitations to show how you are aiming to evaluate the tool as part of your further work. As it is currently, the description of the evaluation still seems a bit out of place and would be better if mentioned in a section called 'further work with the tool' or something similar. It would for instance follow logically from the sentence about the further study on p. 18, l. 6. It is important to make clear how the development of the tool is part of a larger project and this could be mentioned relatively early on (for example in the paragraph on p. 7, l. 7-11 - see below).

In my earlier review, I queried whether the researchers had thought of any of the potential limitations of the tool not being for people who were not in command of the Dutch language and whether there might be ways in which alternatives could be developed for these types of groups. The authors have added a sentence about the tool not being for all groups of parents, but useful for many families. I agree with this, but in your discussion of limitations or thoughts for further research you could perhaps consider whether the tool could be further developed, translated or redesigned, so that such families might benefit as well. If it is currently not suitable for all, are there specific types of families which it will suit more than others? How does this link to health inequalities?

Besides these general comments, I found that the paper needs a thorough proofreading (including paying close attention to when past and present tense is used), as there were a number of small language and grammatical errors, which needed fixing.
A few specific comments:

p. 2, l. 19: '...for parents getting timed and reliable information' - do you mean timely?

p. 7, l. 7-11: I would recommend revising this paragraph:

"This paper describes the development of a tool that helps parents in assessment of their family
needs and information questions, searching and finding information, asking questions and
thereby taking a part in decision-making. After the development of the tool, we will study the
effects of using the tool on parental empowerment and satisfaction on the consultation with a
paediatric rehabilitation"

This would be a logical place to write a bit more about the project - where the development of
the tool sits within the wider project, the Dutch context etc. It has to be made clear that the study
of the effects of using the tool is not happening in the paper itself, but will be part of further
work (see my comments above).

P. 8. L. 22: "At the start of the project, we started with a panel of parents that were involved in
any part of the project and were asked to provide feedback on subsequent steps in the
development process" (Not clear - do you mean all the parents who had been involved in the
project)? "The panel started with 16 parents that were interviewed in an earlier study on parental
information needs" (try to avoid using the word 'start' 3 times in the same paragraph).

p. 8: How was the parent KM recruited?

p. 9, l. 24: "Because of the readability of the paragraphs" - do you mean 'for the sake of
readability'
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