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Author’s response to reviews:

1) Provide clear primary feasibility objectives, outcomes and corresponding criteria for determining success of feasibility;

We agree with the Editor that the manuscript lacks a clear description of the primary feasibility objectives and corresponding criteria. In the revised version of the manuscript we have included an outcome section where the primary feasibility outcomes are described in detail (line 231-238).

2) Provide some justification of the sample size and this needs to be based on key feasibility objectives;

We have revised the section describing sample size to provide a better justification of the number of participants included in the study (line 247-256).

3) The analysis description should include analysis of feasibility outcomes;

We agree with the Editor, and in the revised version of the manuscript we have included a section describing how we assessed the specific criteria used to evaluate the feasibility of the pilot study (line 240-245). In addition, a sentence describing the adherence to sample collection protocol has been added in the results section line 291-292.
4) Consider deleting p-values for significance tests of baseline comparisons reported in Table 2;

We thank the Editor for the comment. In Table 2 we have deleted the p-values and included a statement of “no significant effect between groups” in the Table text.

5) Instead of reporting p-values of comparisons within and between groups, please report estimates of differences between groups (95% CI) in Table 3.

We are not entirely sure if we have understood the Editor’s suggestions for changes in Table 3 accurately. In this revised version, Table 3 has been edited to contain the estimated difference between groups and the corresponding 95% confidence interval. We have deleted p-values for changes within and between groups and included a statement of “no significant differences within groups” in the table text, and changes that were significantly different between groups are marked with a * in Table 3. If we have misinterpreted the suggestions, please let us know and we will make the corrections needed.