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Reviewer's report:

I think this paper is improved by presenting it as a feasibility study. I suggest that any reference to 'pilot-testing' is removed as this is confusing double terminology specifically in the Abstract (background) and Methods (design). Please refer to this study as a feasibility study (only) throughout! p5 Line 100 'Feasibility is defined as...' is not strictly correct. Please change to 'Measures used to assess feasibility were:...' p6 Line 119 members of what? Please clarify in this sentence. Secondary Measures: I agree with the other reviewer about the questionable value of the pre post test results but the authors clearly wish to retain these data in the paper. I therefore suggest that the objective is presented as feasibility of 'using the measures' (please state this p7 Line 150) and to identify possible effect direction and magnitude. p8 Lines 165-166 need to be changed accordingly. Similarly Results may need to be edited to reflect this. p12Line 227 It is unlikely that demographics would change. Rephrase. p15Line 15 should 'efficacious' be 'effective'? p16 Line 280 recruitment rates were VERY low
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