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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your letter dated 11th of February 2019, regarding our manuscript PAFS-D-18-00215R2. We are appreciative of your assessment that the manuscript is potentially acceptable for publication in Pilot and Feasibility Studies. This revised version of the manuscript takes into account the revisions suggested by the Reviewer. All changes are highlighted using track-changes in the manuscript.

In addition we have revised the title for Table 1 and rephrased the description of Table 1 in the methods section line 229-230.

We hope that the revised manuscript is now acceptable for publication in Pilot and Feasibility Studies and are looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,
The results need further revision. E.g., the headings in tables 2&3 can be shown as mean (SD) in a cell, rather than separate them as two cells. Table 3 should clearly indicate that the differences refer to the changes between groups (change from control group minus change from intervention group).

We thank the reviewer for the comment on our results. We have changed the headings in Table 2 and 3 to ‘mean (SD)’ and combined the following cells showing the results to include both mean and SD.

For Table 3 we have updated the heading to more clearly indicate that the differences refer to differences in changes between groups. We have also included an explanation about the differences between groups in the table text.

Revisions should also be made in the text according to the editor's previous comments (on page 10).

We are a bit puzzled by this comment, but we believe that the Reviewer refers to comment #1 from the Editor to the previous revision requesting “Provide clear primary feasibility objectives, outcomes and corresponding criteria for determining success of feasibility”. In the revised version of the manuscript we have updated the discussion (line 303-306, page 10) to include the specific measures of feasibility introduced in the outcome section, in accordance with the Editor’s previous comments. If we have misinterpreted the comment, please let us know and we will adjust the manuscript accordingly.