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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to read your manuscript. I found it to be a well written and clearly described protocol for your feasibility study. I have just a few questions and observations of a generally minor nature

Page 2, line 39 - should there be some additional punctuation between "preparation)" and "additionally"?

Page 7, line 136-7 - "time allowed for consideration" - can you expand briefly on this?

Page 7, line 154 - can you comment on why the various other forms of effective contraception have been omitted from this list?

Page 13, line 295-6 - the dosage regime seems to place something of a burden on the patient to remember to take the trial medicine three times daily, 30 minutes before food. Do you have any information about acceptability?

Page 14, line 308 - can you expand on the reasons for recommending a delayed antibiotic prescribing strategy in preference to a no antibiotic or combined delayed or no antibiotic recommendation?

Page 17, line 375 - I see that the trial is not regarded as a CTIMP on the basis that outcomes do not include treatment efficacy (page 18, line 402). The analysis plan does indicate that the analysis will be "mainly descriptive" and that "no formal comparison between groups will take place". Are you able categorically to state that there will be no comparison at all of clinical outcomes between groups?

Page 18, line 385 - can you clarify what you mean by underlined conditions?

Page 24, lines 512-4 - I didn't quite follow this as written. Can it be amended for clarity?

Page 31, exclusion criterion number 2 - can you provide a reference for the choice of <91% oxygen saturation (NICE CKS for example use <94% https://cks.nice.org.uk/chest-infections-adult#!diagnosisSub)
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