

Dear Marta Topor and co-authors,

Thank you for submitting the revised Stage 1 with careful changes. This version is now very close to in-principle acceptance, thus I invite you to format the next version as “clean” with a separate document attached to show track changes. I have a few final comments for your consideration, most of which are very minor, but worth addressing now because after Stage 1 this part of the manuscript will be locked.

Thank you very much for assessing the latest version of the manuscript. We have addressed your final comments below.

Changes to the manuscript, in the version with tracked changes, are marked with green font.

We have also prepared a clean version of the manuscript.

- You have chosen codebook TA to accommodate a realist epistemology with a reflexive approach -- this is good choice. As one more clarification, I would ask you to add an explicit note regarding \*how\* the codebook will be applied. As Braun & Clarke (2022, p. 7) point out, the codebook philosophy encompasses numerous approaches like matrix, framework, network, and template analyses; are you committing to one of these? I am asking because in the response letter you refer to template analysis (King 2012), but this is not mentioned in the manuscript. I just want to double check to avoid misunderstandings at Stage 2. To be clear, you \*don't\* have to commit to any of these existing approaches, but you can also follow your own codebook/instructions. In such case, I would kindly ask you to create tentative codebook/instructions for the two coders and add these as a supplement so that we have them registered at Stage 1. To give an example, in a recent template analysis study we preregistered the following instructions based on one guiding RQ for two coders: <https://osf.io/umvsv> Note that your instructions can be entirely different and you can recreate a codebook as you work, but having some formalized plan at Stage 1 will allow showing how/what changes occurred, if any (it already reads “coders will be instructed to identify codes...” but let's make these instructions visible to reach the highest levels of transparency!).

Thank you for your response and for pointing out the confusion surrounding the King 2012 reference. Thank you also for sharing your example. As suggested, we have developed our own codebook/instructions for coders which we hope will make our analysis plan more transparent. It has been added to our OSF repository: <https://osf.io/d5cbn>. This has been added to the manuscript, lines 353.

- Minor comment: Your QH1 states: “Participants who received a late DCD diagnosis will have different feelings towards this experience depending on how much time has passed...” This is good, but how will you tackle these temporal differences in practice? For instance, will each participant's current state be situated in Murphy and LeVer's stage model of ADHD? I note this because I've once had an RQ like this and found it very difficult to analyze/report in practice. If I may suggest (ignore this in case it doesn't feel right), one part of the codebook/instructions, if you decide to have that, could be to instruct the coders to evaluate which stage/s (a–f) the participant represents, assuming the stage model of ADHD applies here. [You may skip this entire comment if you're confident that your analysis will produce results that address the temporal dimension without further additions]

Thank you for this important suggestion. Following your advice, in the document linked above, we added instructions for coders to take notes of the time of the diagnosis. We believe that having this information at hand will help us to interpret and categorise the data. However, we do not have pre-set expectations regarding our future participants and how much time could have passed since their

diagnoses. Therefore, we hope that the temporal aspect of data analysis will be guided by the data we obtain.

- Minor comment: you're using the words "self-identity", "self-concept" and "self-perception" on several occasions in the manuscript. Please double check if all these terms are intentionally used with separate meanings or could one be dropped to increase consistency? (I'm recalling Roy Baumeister's lengthy review "The Self" from 1998 -- again, you can rebut this comment in case all three terms are intentional and needed).

Thank you for highlighting this lack of standardisation of terminology. After reviewing the definitions for all three terms, we have decided to apply the term self-concept after Baumeister's (1999) definition as follows: "The individual's belief about himself or herself, including the person's attributes and who and what the self is".

This definition has been clarified in a footnote below line 121.

- Minor comment: I would encourage to rephrase this part -- "themes should emerge from the participants own words rather than the researchers' preconceptions and beliefs" (351). You can keep it as is, but consider e.g., "To investigate the participants' experiences through their own words, a semantic-realist approach to the data is justified" (for a more neutral tone)

Thank you for this suggestion, we have amended the manuscript accordingly, line 408.

- This last comment does not entail any action from your part at the moment, but with reference to earlier reviewer feedback, please allow me to remind to explicitly communicate at Stage 2, in the Discussion or other section, how the results will guide practitioners. This is promised twice, but not yet explained \*how\* (it's ok as long as it becomes clear at Stage 2).

Thank you for this feedback and we will ensure to address this at stage 2 as it is an important aspect of the paper.

Please do not hesitate to contact me for any questions in case some of the above feedback is unclear. I look forward writing an IPA for the next version!

Veli-Matti Karhulahti