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**Reviewer's report:**

As a protocol for a RCT, this is fine - they've ticked all the expected boxes. My personal view is that this study is unlikely to demonstrate impact because it's yet another example of technological determinism i.e. the assumption that providing a technology will 'cause' a change in behaviour! I have argued elsewhere that we need fewer RCTs and more in-depth qualitative studies of technologies in use. But that's not a reason for not publishing the protocol.

Hence as a discretionary revision, perhaps acknowledge the potential limitations of the method?
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