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Reviewer’s report:

Summary:
This paper has been revised and resubmitted for review. I have re-read this thorough and overall I think this paper has much improved in its communication of the study being undertaken.

I have assessed the revised paper against my original comments and I am satisfied, that, overall these have been taken on board and address adequately. There is more detailed information in this paper than previously, it reads better and the justification for the study has improved. The methods section is much more detailed and informative. Figure 1 is more detailed, helpful and it is easier to envisage how the study is being conducted. The discussion section is much improved.

In its current form, I would be in agreement to the publication of this protocol paper. There are some minor essential issues to resolve prior to publication which are stated as follows:

Abstract:
The study/design methods section does not mention any data analysis. One or two sentences summarizing the proposed analysis would be helpful.

Background:
Paragraph 4, last sentence: This does not read well to me and I think this could be rephrased. Also the words ‘over looked’ should be all one word (overlooked).

Paragraph 7, last sentence: I think the words at risk should read ‘at-risk’.

Recruitment:
Second paragraph, first line: I think there are two ‘and’s here, one of which should be deleted.

References:
There are some inconsistencies with the referencing:
• Reference 2 – this does not state the year.
• Reference 4 – this looks incorrect to me (but I may be wrong!) – Please check
journal formatting guidelines.
• Reference 16 – incomplete reference.
• Reference 30 – last author’s surname is current with a small ‘l’ – should this be a capital L?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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