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Reviewer's report:

Comments on author's response to original comments (using numbering of original comments)

2. Suggest modification of final sentence of conclusion in the abstract, so that it reads similarly the final line of the conclusion on P14

3. Thanks, also recommend deletion of "Statistical significance was set at 0.05" (P9)

4. My original comment was that "although feasibility of recruitment is mentioned in the Background, this has not been framed as question in the list of primary questions of the study". The authors respond that "Feasibility of the intervention is first in the list of primary questions". However I still feel if recruitment is being assessed then it should specifically be stated in the list of primary questions (as it is further on in the methods section).

I am still unable to see recruitment as a percentage of all those screened, which I think would be 20 (recruited) / 212 (screened) = 9.4%

5. I appreciate the authors comments regarding consideration of supporting participants following discharge, but feel this does not fully address the issue of whether an intervention of 4 weeks is too long.

6. The authors state in the discussion that "Adults undergoing inpatient rehabilitation were able to undertake a mean of 57 minutes of extra upper limb practice during a mean session of 73 minutes", but I am still unable to locate this information in the results section.

7. As timing of session was not a feasibility question, and results regarding timing are not presented, it would be more useful to discuss session timing as a factor possibly affecting adherence, than to recommend that sessions take place at the end of the day.

Additional comment (not noticed previously)

P8 line 181: "holds" should be "holes"
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