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Reviewer's report:

Comments to Authors. Listed below is a set of issues that should improve this manuscript for the readers.

1. Page 2, paragraph 2, line 3. Insert [years] after [65].
2. Paragraph 2, lines 5 and 6. Delete [(target = 8)] twice, since the block sizes are not needed until the results are presented; however, they can lead to unblinding of those that are party to this information.
3. Page 3, line 2. Include date of registration as well as the date when the first patient was randomised. It appears that the latter is 27 March 2013 as seen on Page 26.
4. Page 4, paragraph 2, line 6. In what sense are you using [significant]? If it is statistical, then suggest you use [statistically] in front of it; if not then replace by another word such as [important]. Save significant for its statistical context. Also Page 5, paragraph 1, lines 6, 15 and 19.
5. Page 5, paragraph 1, line 16. Suggest rewriting as [A dose-response effect ...].
6. Page 6, paragraph 2, Objective 3, lines 1 and 2. Delete [in order] in front of [to] as the words are redundant in English. Also Page 12, paragraph 1(tem) 1, line 2.
7. Page 8, paragraph 3, lines 5 and 8. Make each [N] into lower case as [n]. Sample sizes are lower case and population sizes are upper case.
8. Page 8, paragraph 3, line 8. Suggest including a phrase like: [However, we will try to minimize dropouts in our study as suggested by Little RJA et al in NEJM 2012-Oct-04 on missing data in RCTs.]. The paper suggests 18 ways to help minimize missing data in trials.
9. Page 9, paragraph 1. What software was used to justify the sample size calculations?
11. Page 10, paragraph 2, line 13. Add after [meeting] the phrase [and we plan to report on the rate of attendance].
12. Page 11, paragraph 1, line 2. Are there checklists to ensure/measure compliance?
13. Page 13, paragraph 1, line 4. Replace [ranging] by [varying]. Also Page 13, paragraph 2, lines 2 and 3. Also Page 14, paragraphs 2, 15, paragraphs 3, 13 and paragraph 4, paragraph 15. Also Page 15, paragraph 1, paragraph 3, paragraphs 2, 12, and paragraphs 3, 15. Also Page 16, paragraphs 1, paragraphs 3, 5 and 6.
14. Page 13, paragraph 2, line 5. Suggest rewrite as [5(low) and 25(high)] as done in the rest of
the scales. This was very helpful to interpreting the data from these scales; however it should be done for ALL scales.

15. P 13, p 2, l 7. Should [overall] be between [the] and [scale]?


20. P 16, p 1, l 5 and 14. Provide an interpretation like the rest of the scales.

21. P 19, p 1, l 10. Could the blocking not handle this even for groups smaller than 16 without revealing the block sizes?

22. P 19, p 2, l 3. Another good place to cite the Little paper. See 8.

23. P 19, p 3, l 6. Will the difference in payment not possibly lead to a confounder between the groups?

24. P 20, p 3. Add a phrase to not reveal the block size here as well.

25. P 21, p 3, l 2. Provide a R(eference) to GCP. Also replace [is] by [are] since data is a plural word.


27. P 22, p 2, last l. Do you have any goals for moving onto the full trial since this is a feasibility study?


29. P 25, p 1, l 5 and 10. Replace [this] by [these].

30. P 28, R 7, l 1. Insert a space between [satisfaction] and [approach].

31. P 28, R 10, l 2. Replace [et al] by more authors. Trials likes to publish the first 30 authors before using [et al].


34. P 29, R 21, l 2. Translate the title into English and enclose in [square brackets] with the language in (round brackets) at the end of the article.

35. P 29, R 24, l 2. Is [G] really part of the names?

36. P 29, R 30, l 3. Provide date of last access for online documents.

37. P 29, R 34, l 1. Is [SE-SURG] really a name?

38. P 30, R 46. Where is this located? Also P 30, R 57, l 2.

39. P 31, R 64, l 1. The 6th authors is [Haynes RB].