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Reviewer's report:

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

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

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.

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

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

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.

Ethics approvals usually include a protocol number.

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