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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your consideration of our paper. We have made the minor revisions requested and hope that it is now acceptable for publication.

Point by point responses to the reviewer comments are given below. Changes made to existing text in the manuscript are shown with tracked changes and are highlighted in yellow.

Reviewer reports:

1. Page 6, Line 125: “Study sit” should read “study site”

Response: We have updated the text to correct the mistake from ‘study sit’ to ‘study site’:
“…at the feasibility study site....”

2. Page 7, Line 143: If it is not relevant that the research fellows were female based on the nature of the interview questions, suggest to remove their gender.

Response: We have removed the reference to gender as this was not relevant to the interview questions. The sentence now reads:

“These were conducted by FM and KS, who are PhD qualified research fellows…”

3. Page 19, Line 393: The authors added information here on what feasibility aspects may not be captured this study. It may be helpful to also elaborate on specific recommendations from this study that will be used to make modifications to the full-scale trial. For example, is there a recommended modification to when the leaflets are given to patients based on the findings of this qualitative study? Will the modified leaflet based on this study be used in the full-scale trial? These additions can go into the main discussion rather than the limitations.

Response: We have now added the following details about recommendations for the full-scale trial:

“Finally, this study has helped to provide some recommendations for how the leaflet can be best used in the main trial. First, the main trial should make use of the final, updated version of the leaflet, as this was developed based on patient feedback as detailed in this paper. Second, study sites in the main trial should aim to have a clear plan in place detailing both who will be distributing the leaflet and when it should be provided to the patient. The current study indicated that a lack of time and resources can make it challenging to find a member of staff to distribute the leaflet. As a result, the main study sites may find it useful to address this in their planning to determine the timing and staffing that would be most feasible for their site. Finally, where it is not possible to find the resources or staffing to distribute a leaflet, main trial sites could consider providing the leaflet in another format, such as a poster that is displayed on the wards. Although this may be a less optimal format, it may still help to provide patients access to information that they are keen to receive.”