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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you for reviewing our updated manuscript and the opportunity to address additional reviewer comments. We are very pleased that the manuscript was considered potentially acceptable for publication in your journal. We have responded to all revisions suggested by the reviewers.

We have attached:

(1) Authors’ response to each of the reviewers’ and editors’ comments.
(2) A revised manuscript with edits made according to the reviewers’ suggested revisions.
We greatly appreciate this opportunity and hope our revisions make the paper acceptable for publication. Please don’t hesitate to be in contact should you require any further information or clarification.

These amendments have been approved by all the authors.

Yours faithfully,

Simon de Lusignan

Technical comments:

1. Upon resubmission, please remove any tracked changes or highlighting and include only a single clean copy of the manuscript. Please ensure the document is in the final form for publication; please upload only files that are to be published. If you wish to respond to these revision requests, please insert the information into the designated input box only.

Authors’ response:

As requested, we have only included a clean copy of the manuscript, which doesn’t include any tracked changes or highlighting. This is the final version of the manuscript for publication, and all files for inclusion in the manuscript have been uploaded.

2. In Funding, please state whether or not the funding body played any roles in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

The following statement has been added to the Funding section:

"JM has provided feedback on the design of the study and the protocol, and the manuscript has been reviewed by other key representatives from Eli Lilly."

3. Thank you for providing a statement regarding the Availability of data and materials. However, we cannot currently accept the information provided as it does not meet our
Editorial policies (see https://eur02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.biomedcentral.com%2Fgetpublished%2Feditorial-policies%23DataandMaterialRelease&amp;data=02%7C01%7Cs.lusignan%40surrey.ac.uk%7C7C7cc911ed26f6484def7008d6c18e51a4%7C6b902693107440aa9e21d89446a2ebb5%7C0%F0%7C%7C0%7C636909214330535092&amp;data=ZcsByzrXFIJ4E8bIDV9pZp5ygtuj5zMYTY1%2BsIB8ZQ68%3D&amp;reserved=0).

Authors’ response:>>

We have amended the statement for “Availability of data and materials” to comply with editorial policies of the journal. The manuscript doesn’t include any data as it is a study protocol, so the statement now only says, “Not applicable”.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer 1: The manuscript has been much improved and I have no more comments.

Authors’ response:>>

We are pleased that the reviewer is satisfied with our amendments, and thank them for their time in reviewing the manuscript.