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Reviewer's report:

The authors have clearly done the revision and replied to all the reviewer's comments however the revision looks rather 'sketchy' in some places. I think the following points still need to be addressed.

* Introducing new notations, week X and week Y, does not add clarity neither to the Abstract or the paper. What do you want to say to the reader in the abstract when you write 'Measures at T0 (i.e. week 0), T1 (i.e. week X) and 48 T2 (i.e. week Y) ….'?

What are these week 0, week X and week Y?

Presumably, the reader should guess that week 0 is a baseline but what should he/she guess about weeks X and Y?

It applies to all entries of week 0, week X and week Y throughout the text.

I suggest the authors should think more carefully about their writing style.

* Page 16: the authors added mentioning 'contamination questionnaire'. What is this questionnaire and how are you going to measure the potential contact with trial participants from the intervention cluster?

* Authors added ICC calculation to the study. On what quantitative outcome will it be based?

* I don't think CONSORT and SPIRIT checklists are really needed for the paper. Appropriate mentioning and justification in the text (and references) would be enough.
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