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I have reviewed the authors’ responses to my previous concerns and have only two minor points to make, which can be considered discretionary revisions.

First, in the supplementary tables, Table 1 uses n (%) and Tables 2 and 3 % (n). My personal preference is for the former and for the same system to be used throughout the paper.

Second, the authors have a somewhat idiosyncratic approach to a CONSORT flow diagram. Normally such a diagram would include the numbers lost to follow up and the numbers analysed. As this data is included elsewhere in the paper, and can be identified with close reading of the supplementary tables for instance, I am relaxed about whether the authors revise the participant flow diagram or not.

Finally by way of clarification, my point in my earlier review regarding the sample size calculation was that the control event rate in the pre-post audit prior to the trial was 23%, but the authors selected 20% as the control event rate for the trial. It was simply pedantry on my part to wonder why 20% was used rather than 23%, when the later was generated by audit data. A minor detail.

I am satisfied with the authors’ responses and recommend publication. I wish the authors well with their future work and look forward to more outputs from this programme.
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