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Author’s response to reviews:

Many thanks for considering our manuscript for publication and for providing us with a set of helpful comments. We found these suggestions very useful in clarifying our thinking and improving the manuscript. We have responded to each comment in turn below and reference specific portions of the revised manuscript where the reviewer’s comments are addressed. Changes in the revised text have been made using the track changes mode. We have assumed that previous versions up to now have been acceptable. Therefore, in order to avoid confusion we have added the new revisions to a cleaned document without the previous tracked changes.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Rumana Newlands
(On behalf of all authors)

Comment 1. Table 2 - criteria used: for most of you feasibility indicators, the criteria used is 'no major issues'. This is very ambiguous, and suggest that you did not pre-specify a set of criteria for the pilot trial. If that was the case, please state it clearly in the footnote. Also please add examples of issues you considered as 'major issues' that would indicate a full-scale trial is not feasible in criteria used column to make it clear to the reader.

Our response: Thank you again for this useful suggestion. We agree that 'no major issues' is ambiguous and therefore, we have removed this from the manuscript: ‘Primary outcomes’ (line 34, page 9), ‘Discussion’ (line 8, page 23), and the Table 2 (page 13).

As our aim was to evaluate any issues identified in this pilot and hence, provide solutions, if modifiable, and take decisions towards progression to a definitive trial, we did not have a pre-specified set of criteria for all the indicators. To clarify this ‘Primary outcomes’ (line 30, page 9), ‘Discussion (line 8, page 23) and Table 2 (page 13) have been edited. In Table 2, column 2 (‘criteria used’) has been removed and we have highlighted any issues that were identified in this trial in the relevant sections based on what we have already stated in this manuscript.
2. Conclusions in both abstract and main manuscript states that this study "confirmed" the benefits of providing free WW vouchers for weight loss ............. This is overstating your findings (particularly the term Confirmed), given this is pilot trial with a small sample size, overlapping confidence intervals and other methodological issues which makes it trial prone for bias. Suggest revising this sentence; perhaps rephrase it to something like "this pilot trial indicates providing free ..... 

Our response: These sentences have been edited as suggested under abstract (Page 2, line 31) and main manuscript (Page 28, line 32).

Additional edits

1. Version number and date have been updated.

2. In Page 10, line 32- the word ‘impacts’ has been changed to ‘impact’.

3. Some previous texts of the Table 2 (please see sections in page 13: Randomisation, Setting) have been edited to clarify these further in relation to what we have already stated in this manuscript. A new sentence also has been added under Recruitment/What did work well in this table.

4. Page 19, line 23- the page number has been updated.
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