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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for asking me to review this paper.

I think it is well-written and important to publish

Major comment is that it is crucial to have more information about how and when women were initially approached so the reader can understand the context. It is not enough just to refer to protocol and trial results - the paper should stand on its own. Also applies to places where say "described in detail elsewhere" without saying where, and [submitted for publication].

Need to explain what two stage consent pathway involves?

There were different response rates by trial arm. Did the women know the results of the pilot trial at the time of completing either questionnaire?

There is mention of seven babies who died and did not complete or were not sent one or more questionnaires. It is not clear whether these were the total deaths and what checks were in place before sending questionnaires. Was there any adaptation to the approach or questionnaire if a baby had died? Although the responses were not quantitatively different between bereaved and non-bereaved parents, were there any qualitative differences?

Page 4 line 78: ?add "and improving the experience of participants"

Page 13 lines 293-4: could be disappointed even if had fully understood. Reword?
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