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Reviewer's report:

Major revisions
Please update the abstract 'methods' section. The design is currently described as a "randomized, controlled, prospective feasibility study". In addressing my earlier peer review comments, you elected to drop the term feasibility study and this needs to be consistent throughout. I would also make reference to the cohort study running alongside the trial in the abstract.

You have elected not to describe this study as a 'pilot' trial and will still test effectiveness. I am still not clear that you will have the power to do this in your sample size calculation: is 50 ppts enough to compare intervention and control groups? I don't understand why you are putting the sample from the cohort study into this figure as this isn't a randomised comparator. Can you review your sample size text to be sure this is clear - removing any reference to the observational cohort study from the sample size of the trial data (although by all means retain the separate description of why this cohort group was formed and a sample of 150 people deemed sufficient for your proposed analysis).

Notwithstanding the latter point, if you are describing this as an RCT (not pilot), then the first paragraph of the methods section should be clearer: you state you are recruiting 200 participants, however as only 50 of these will effectively be randomised this is somewhat misleading. The first paragraph of the methods section needs to refer to an RCT (n=50) and also the observational cohort running alongside it (n=150) as this isn't clear enough. Then the subsequent structuring of the methods section is coherent.

Minor revision
Can you please describe the participant recruitment procedure in a little more detail. Who is scanning medical records to identify participants and get their permission to pass information onto the study team? What type of information will they be provided with, and how/by whom will written consent be obtained.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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