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Author’s response to reviews:

June 12, 2019

Dear Dr. Husband,

We are pleased to resubmit the enclosed manuscript “A research protocol for a pilot, randomized controlled trial designed to examine the feasibility of a dyadic versus individual yoga program for family caregivers of glioma patients undergoing radiotherapy” (PAFS-D-18-00234) to BMC Pilot and Feasibility Studies as a Study Protocol.

We appreciate the reviewers’ favorable review and thoughtful comments regarding our manuscript. We have carefully addressed each concern that you and Review 2 have raised. By incorporating the corrections, we believe we have improved this manuscript, which we think will be of interest to the readers of the journal.
We would like to reiterate that this study protocol is being submitted solely to BMC Pilot and Feasibility Studies and has not been published elsewhere. All authors have read and approved the manuscript and do not have actual or potential conflicts of interest. All authors will have full control of all primary data and they agree to allow the journal to review their data if requested as they become available.

Thank you for your further consideration of the manuscript. I look forward to hearing from you regarding the results of your second review.

Sincerely,

Kathrin Milbury, PhD

Reviewer reports:

Associate Editor:

Thank you for your review of our manuscript. We have addressed your concerns below.

Pg 3 line 35 should read increased morbidity?
Thank you. We made the correction.

Pg 4 line 31 is systemic the correct word? Seems to be arguing for a holistic approach?
We agree that the term holistic is more accurate and made the change.

Pg 8 line 6 insert a comma after 'individual' to improve syntax Pg 8 line 11 insert a comma after 'caregiver' to improve syntax Pg 10 line 40 close quotes on 'now'
We have corrected the syntax errors.

Pg 11 line 29 should read 'Research staff identify ....'?
We have made the correction.

Pg 11 Line 35 should read 'patient's caregiver...'? We have made the correction.

Reviewer #1: The authors report on the background and study design of a pilot, randomized controlled trial designed to examine the feasibility of a dyadic versus individual yoga program for family caregivers of glioma patients undergoing radiotherapy. The manuscript is well written with updated references and adequate study design. This paper can be accepted for publication in its current form without any modifications.

Thank you for your favorable review and recommending our manuscript for publication.

Reviewer #2: Overall a clear well-written study protocol for an important study that continues to build on previous research.

Thank you for your careful review of our manuscript and your helpful comments.

Minor comments include:

Page 5 Line 52 "An RCT is currently conducted with 75 dyads randomized to the DY, CY, or WLC group" given that later on in the sample size section you state that 75 dyads will be recruited, does this mean that recruitment is complete? If this is not the case then please remove this sentence as the detail is provided in later sections.

The trial is currently implemented, and we have consented 35 dyads. Thus, we have removed the sentence.

Where DY and CY groups are referred to it should be groups plural, there are a number of cases where it is singular (group) e.g. Page 6 line 6

We have made the correction through the manuscript.
There are places where the tense seems to be inconsistent, protocols should be written in future tense. E.g. Page 9 Line 11 should be sessions will be.

We have now corrected the tense so that the study procedures are described in future tense.

Page 11 Line 19 consider including the detail regarding sample size considerations here rather than further down.

We have now moved the sample size considerations to page 11.

Page 13 Line 12 should be participants instead of participations per group.

We have made the correction.

Page 14 Line 4 assumes that the trial is feasible, what if this study is not feasible? You still use the results to design future studies, but be careful with wording in the protocol.

We have now more carefully worded this sentence.

Ethics approvals usually include a protocol number.

We have now included the protocol number.

Rather than a blank CONSORT checklist, consider completing the appropriate sections of the CONSORT extension for pilot and feasibility studies.

We have now completed the appropriate sections of the CONSORT checklist.