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Reviewer's report:

I found this paper interesting and well-written. I am not clear what the true contribution of the PDA, which is central to the intervention, is in comparison to other similar PDAs. This is not fully discussed and merits some consideration in the manuscript. Also why was 6 weeks chosen as the length of the intervention. Is there a convention for the choice? Again this needs to be discussed in the manuscript. Six weeks is not a particularly long time for behavior change/improvement. It certainly does not address long-term change/improvement. While the Triple Aim is mentioned a couple of times in the manuscript, clear connections from the intervention tested here and the Triple Aim are not made, at least not convincingly. The Triple Aim is interested in POPULATION health improvement and I saw no connection to or mention of this aim. Moreover it seemed to me that the "n" was small and the recruitment on the passive side. This merits further discussion.
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