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Reviewer's report:

Thanks to the authors for their submission.

Abstract:

No feasibility outcomes are listed in the method section. Also, no statistical methodology discussed in the method section.

Unit of time needs to be reported.

Wondering whether the conclusion be scope of larger trial or it is feasible to conduct larger trial?

Main body:

Background:

The first line does not make sense. Also, it does not look good to start a manuscript with this type of sentence. If these studies were adequately powered to detect a meaningful difference sample size is not an issue. Why the outcomes are reported in the background section? Overall, the background section is poorly phrased.

Methods:

Nothing mentioned about ethics approval. No success rate and results are reported for the following outcome 'clarity and usability of protocol and Case Report Form (CRF)' is mentioned. Nothing mentioned how the patient demographics were reported in the statistical analysis section. There is no justification why the authors used non-parametric approach for continuous outcomes. The statistical analysis section is poorly written. It needs to say which method is used for which outcome. Nothing mentioned about effect estimate, level of significance, whether the test is one-sided or two-sided.

Results tables need some revision. For example, in table 3, age is reported as '50.7(15.4)' while it written as 'Age (years; mean, SD)'. It should be reported as CONSORT extension.

In summary, this manuscript requires major revisions, especially in the areas discussed above. I suggest the authors to follow the CONSORT extension for pilot and feasibility studies and revise the manuscript accordingly.
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