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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor Thabane

We thank you for reviewing our manuscript and for giving us valuable feedback on its form and content. We have revised it extensively.

Most importantly, based on your comments, we have chosen to present the material as one study only. The development of the intervention (that was previously referred to as Study 1) is now integrated in the feasibility trial under the “Intervention” heading in the Method section. We believe that this change of format has contributed to making the paper more concise without a major loss of information.

We have revised the presentation of the feasibility trial (previously referred to as Study 2) with consideration of the CONSORT extended checklist. We have carefully examined the document of the feasibility/pilot question that you suggested. We have also, again, examined the paper by Abbott from 2014 that we used as a guideline in the development of the trial. We agree that some of the questions that we address in the paper are perhaps more alike those that you would typically include in a pilot study. However, we still believe that most questions are of a feasibility nature, and that the paper as a whole is therefore best framed this way. We acknowledge your extensive knowledge on this matter and would be grateful for any additional thoughts or comments from you in relation to this question.

Additional responses to your comments on the paper:

We hope that the aims and objectives are now consistently reflecting the work done in the paper. We regret our lack of clarity in the previous paper.
We now present information about the ethical approval only once.

We have rephrased the section on the functional analyses and included a reference.

We have chosen not to present quotes to illustrate the points we make in the development of the intervention (now under the heading Intervention in the Method section, previously Study 1) to avoid making this section too extensive.

We have made the primary outcomes of the full scale evaluation explicit in relation to the aim of the present study.

We have rewritten the discussion and hope that it is now clear what the next steps are.

We have removed all tables from the text.

We hope that you will find our attempts at addressing the concerns you raised about the manuscript satisfactory. We would be happy to make further revisions where you believe that the manuscript is not yet up to the standard of publications in your journal.

Sincerely

The authors