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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editorial team,
please find details of our revisions below, which have been made in response to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer's report:
Overall well written manuscript. Generally clear bar a few minor points raised below - if these could be addressed/clarified it would improve the manuscript further.

Major compulsory revisions
None

Minor Essential revisions
Exclusion criteria
Slightly confusing section about exclusion criteria re pleural fluid. One paragraph says US should not influence randomisation – next paragraph says that if >1/3 hemithorax occupied by fluid then not for randomisation. Could this be clarified please?

THIS HAS BEEN AMENDED IN THE TEXT TO RESOLVE CONFUSION

US scans – what level of experience do operators have to have?

WE HAVE CLARIFIED THAT US OPERATORS NEED TO HAVE SUFFICIENT EXPERIENCE TO BE ABLE TO SCAN AND INTERPRET IMAGES INDEPENDENTLY
Safety reporting
Adverse events – number 4 Should be \( \geq 20 \) bpm over baseline NOT less than
CORRECTED - MANY THANKS