Reviewer’s report

Title: Training attention control of very preterm infants: protocol for a feasibility study of the Attention Control Training (ACT)

Version: 0 Date: 27 May 2019

Reviewer: Emma King

Reviewer's report:

I thought that this was an interesting paper that gives a clear overview of your protocol and what you are setting out to achieve. I assume that your project is already underway as the tense of the article seems to change from future to past tense, so it would be worth editing this for clarity. I have a few minor comments and suggestions for clarification:

Page 6 Line 28 - missing word? 'the Attention Control Training (ACT)...

Page 8 Line 1 - would be worth clarifying that you have specific recruitment and retention criteria, which you mention below.

Page 8 Line 54 - if the infant is not calm and alert enough to carry out the training within the first weekly session then when is this done? You speak about it further down but worth clarifying here.

Page 9 Line 26 - missing bracket after the (protocol version 14...

Page 10 Line 59 - missing word 'and fails to engage with the ? for a continuous'

Page 14 Line 27 - In your sample size I would be concerned that with such a small sample size a 10% drop-out would only represent two participants, which doesn't give you a lot of leeway given this is a population with sick infants who are probably going through a very stressful time in their lives. I appreciate if your study is already underway this might not be possible to increase the study size.

Page 15 Line 54 - I am confused why parents would have been contacted by gatekeepers AFTER expressing an interest in the study? I assumed from reading the rest of your recruitment strategy that gatekeepers were assisting in recruiting participants?

Page 19 Line 51 - complex rather than complexity?
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