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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions
This was quite a low response rate, it needs to be said in the discussion that this will be a highly motivated sub-sample who are already engaged and willing to participate on-line.

The response of the short survey are the more interesting as these are the people who were willing to participate but did not have an successful experience with the internet method. Not enough information is given about reasons for poor follow up which were related to the study (not liking the questions - more is needed on this so that questions can be developed better). How many of those who dropped out of the trial reported study problems?

The 'fudging' aspects reported here are very interesting and are what make this paper most useful to others doing internet trials. I feel more depth should be given to reasons people don't report the truth on an internet trial. If 56% were not consistent, what does this mean?

Discretionary Revisions
The survey was carried out using the internet, this mean people who participated in the trial but didn't like the internet method will be less likely to engage in the survey too. I would suggest putting in the recommendations that future surveys should be multimedia (postal, phone and internet) to capture the views of people who tried the internet and were put off (which might have been 2/3 of the people in the trial for all we know).
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