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Author's response to reviews: see over
Editors’ email
- Please could you change the title to conform to journal style for study protocol articles.
The title should follow the format "___________: study protocol for a randomized controlled trial".
Our protocol includes a randomized controlled trial, but is in fact a mixed methods feasibility study. Whilst we are happy to modify the title to come in line with journal policy, we do not feel it appropriate to describe our study simply as a RCT.

We hope that you feel that we have adequately addressed these points in our manuscript, and look forward to your final editorial decision on our submission in the near future.

Yours sincerely

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul Hilton
Consultant Gynaecologist and Urogynaecologist