

Response to Reviewers Comments:

Thank you for your positive response to our journal submission. We appreciate the constructive feedback and have strove to incorporate that feedback into our journal article. The itemized response is as follows:

Reviewer #1:

1. Although two text were used in the discussion, Polit, Beck & Hungler and Melnyk & Fineout-Overholt the authors agree that the depth of the discussion could be improved through the utilization of further research text books. Thank you for suggesting Lipsey 1990. We have incorporated it (page 11, paragraph 3) along with four additional text books Durso & Mellgren, 1989; Roberts & Burke, 1989; Burns & Grove, 2005 and 2003 which we believe enhances the caliber of dialogue.
2. A definition of feasibility study was provided. The discussion of feasibility in relation to pilot studies was enhanced (page 4 paragraph 2 & page 5 paragraph 1).
3. The inconsistencies in the paper were a result of discussion related to the terms purpose and hypothesis. We appreciate you bringing this inconsistency to light. We have changed the wording to reflect more clarity in the distinction between the overall purpose of the pilot and the hypothesis of the pilot. The abstract has been adjusted to achieve consistency with paragraph two. The statement ‘The purpose of the pilot study is to examine the effects of co-bedding on parental self-efficacy’ was removed from the design section. This will help to prevent confusion related to the over all purpose of the pilot study. The use of the term ‘parental stress’ instead of ‘parental anxiety’ had been an oversight. Parental stress was changed to parental anxiety for consistency with use of terminology.

Clarity was provided in relationship to the various constructs being measured.

This was achieved through consistent use of the same constructs throughout the paper (page 6 paragraph 3 and page 7 paragraph 3).

4a. Both State and Trait anxiety were measured in the pilot. Rational was provided. (page 9 paragraph 1). I searched the literature extensively without success for the reliabilities and validity for this tool with parents of preterm infants. I then contacted Charles Spielberger directly. He responded “Given the specific population in which you are working, I doubt that you will be able to find specific reliability, validity and normative data for the STAI or any other measure for the participants in your study, and recommend that you consider comparing your study participants with the normative data for normal adults reported in the STAI Test Manual.” I therefore left the reliabilities and validity as previously cited.

b. Thank you for pointing out the confusion related to the construct ‘co-regulation.’ A definition has been provided (page 6, paragraph 3) and more consistency with use of the term has been utilized throughout the article. Further information has been provided in relation to measurement techniques. The time frame for the NCASAR measurement was clarified (see page 9 paragraph 2). The specific parameter being measured by each tool was specified (see page 8 paragraph 4 and page 9 paragraph 2).

5a. A table and a descriptor of the differences between the groups were added in a section titled ‘Sample Characteristics’ (page 8, paragraph 2 &3)

Reviewer #2

1. Title: We agree that the title could better reflect the content of the paper. Thank you for your suggestion which we have adopted for use with this article. The new title is, 'Co-bedding twins: How pilot study findings guided improvements in planning a larger multi-centre trial'
2. Table: Explanation was added for the table at the end under a section titled 'Results' (page 10, paragraph 3)
3. Non-verb agreement: In three location 'data was', was changed to 'data were.' (three times in the Rational for Revised Protocol/Data Collection section and once in Pilot Project Methods/Data Collection).
4. Font: The font was changed to Times New Roman throughout the paper.
5. IRB approval: The section 'Importance of Pilot studies' describes the importance of ethical approval while conducting a pilot study (page 6, paragraph 2). The sentence 'Ethical approval was obtained through the IWK Research Ethics Board' was added to the section Pilot Project/Methods/Design (page 7, paragraph 1).
6. APA: References were adjusted to reflect proper APA formatting. We apologize for this oversight and appreciate you bringing this to our attention.