

Martha Sleutel, RN, CNS, PhD (Reviewer 2)

Reviewer

Recommendation    Accept With Minor Revisions

Term:

(1) Answer yes or no for each of the questions below:

Do you have a conflict of interest in reviewing this paper?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X \_\_\_\_\_

Do you perceive a conflict of interest for the authors within the paper? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X \_\_\_\_\_

Do you agree to hold its contents confidential?

Yes X \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments to  
Editor:

Does this paper meet the IRB standards? Mentions ethical approval and informed consent, but does not specifically say that the study had IRB approval. I suspect this was an oversight - needs to be corrected.

Yes X \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

IS A STATISTICAL REVIEWER NEEDED? No

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X \_\_\_\_\_

Comments to  
Author:

This was a well-written, interesting manuscript. I wondered if the title might be adjusted to better reflect the content, such as Co-bedding twins: How pilot study findings guided improvements in planning a larger multi-center trial. The narrative could explain that it improved funding success, but the bulk of the article was about how the pilot experience led to improvements in the bigger study. The table at the end could use more explanation. Since most of the article is about process, it would be interesting to have a bit more results from this pilot, even though the n was small. Also, since there was so little to criticize in this manuscript, I'll point out some minor flaws. The proper noun-verb agreement is data were, not data was. Halfway through the manuscript, the font switched from Ariel to Times Roman. There needs to be a sentence somewhere specifically about IRB approval. (Not just following ethical approval...). Lastly, the reference page formatting is not correct for APA. Overall, this submission is a good review of the purpose of a pilot study, and provides an exemplar of how a specific pilot improved the quality of a larger study proposal.