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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor

We regret to inform you that the textual overlap remains too high for publication. This overlap mainly exists under the Background heading (page 4, first and second paragraph), the Inclusion and exclusion criteria heading (page 9), the Assessments heading (most notably on page 10 from point vii and down), and the Trial outcome analysis heading (page 11).
RESPONSE:

We understand your concern about textual overlap with our previous Protocol paper for this study. I have re-written the introduction section, removing any verbatim sentences from our previous paper.

We have also re-worded the Inclusion/Exclusion section, and the Assessments section. However, we are really struggling with these sections and the statistical analysis section, as it is very hard to re-word these very fact-specific sections without inadvertently changing their meaning.

An alternative would be to remove this material and instead refer to our original Protocol paper, but I am aware that one of the reviewers requested more detail on the assessment tools rather than less. We would therefore be grateful for a steer from you in this area.