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Reviewer's report:

This is an excellent study protocol that is well written and easy to follow. I have a few suggestions for improvement.

The objectives are given, in the manuscript, three different ways: (i) assess feasibility etc.; (ii) provide evidence for feasibility etc.; and (iii) determine, evaluate and explore various feasibility aspects. The objective only needs to be stated once (provide evidence is what the main aim appears to be), although there may be specific objectives that follow this global objective. In addition, the objectives are worded as a work plan, what the authors intend to do, and not what the authors wish to know. Determine is a strong verb for data collected on a sample, which is set up only to provide estimates. I suggested using estimate rather than determine. Evaluate is a method as is explore. I suggest the authors wish to estimate and identify. However, the different work plan parts could be consolidated into sub-objectives that relate to estimates about participants (recruitment, protocol adherence, data completions etc.) and to the study staff protocol fidelity (etc.). With a 3rd objective about the qualitative component which is to identify participants view about the study that would inform changes to the protocol for a main study.

A restructuring of the objectives based on the unit of analysis, participants, staff, etc and what the authors wish to know not what they wish to do is needed. As a result of this restructuring, the methods will need to math the objectives. The abstract should have the same objectives. Other than this rewording and restructuring, the rest of the protocol is strong.
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