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Reviewer’s report:

General
The authors have made a good job of addressing the concerns raised in my last review and the paper now provides a good (and rarely seen) explanation of the rationale behind the design of the pragmatic DIAMOND trial. I have no further comments.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept without revision

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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