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Reviewer’s report:

The authors investigated recruitment of healthy volunteers into an interventional study without financial compensation at a single centre in France. The investigators also mention a randomized trial, but, unfortunately, it is absolutely not clear to me what the authors wanted to investigate with the randomized trial. Probably, the present study was a sub-study of the mentioned randomized trial.

Overall the manuscript has an average level of wording – I recommend that a native speaker should review it before re-submission.

Regarding the content, I think it is an interesting topic to investigate recruitment of healthy volunteers without direct financial incentives; therefore I think the value this study adds to the topic is good.

However, there are several major issues that have to be revised:

Abstract
1. Why do you use the term biomedical in this setting?
2. The objective of the study is not clear to the reader when only reading the abstract!
3. This is a randomized trial, but I cannot see that from the abstract!
4. Who are managers? You have to give a contrast; otherwise it is difficult to understand if you only have the abstract.

Methods – interventional study
1. Please drop the term biomedical; it does not suit here.
2. I do not really understand the objective of the randomized trial. When were the patients randomized?
   a. What was the intervention / control group? How long did the intervention take?
   b. How long did the intervention take?
   c. What was the primary endpoint of the study?
   d. How long was the follow-up?
3. You mention 210 HV were needed, how did you come up with this number?
Any power calculation, please report details about this!!
Methods – selection criteria
1. Selection criteria, why do you say “patients”, should be HV, isn’t it?
2. I would change “selection” to “eligibility” criteria.
3. Why did you exclude pregnant women?

Methods - recruitment
1. You mention a database (Logic CIC), have you chosen HVs randomly or did you contact all of them? Please clarify this.
2. How were the HVs selected for this existing database? Are the contacts updated regularly? How many variables do collect in this database? Please provide more information or references for this database.

Methods – data collection
1. What do you mean by “was sought”?

Methods – statistical analysis
1. Why did you choose the age cut-offs? Making cut-offs has several limitations regarding statistical analysis.
2. Why did you choose the median of the satisfaction scores? Did you have an idea about a minimal important difference for this satisfaction score?
3. What was the dependent variable in your logistic regression? You use a logistic regression, so it must by a binary variable. I assume you build a cut-off again. Please report that clearly! Please also report the motivation and rationale about the cut-off.
4. Why did you choose the listed variables? Why did you not include whether HVs were recruited by the database or the other media strategy?

Results – recruitment process
1. What do you mean by “cognizance”?
2. Please be clearer in describing your findings, e.g. “Younger age of HV was associated with word-of-mouth” can be changed to “Younger HVs were more often recruited to the study by word-of-mouth….”
3. In ALL tables: Please provide frequencies and proportions in all rows not only the columns.

Results – in general
1. Please always provide absolute frequencies, denominators, and proportions for all findings you report in the text.
2. Please don’t report medians and ranges in the text, put them all into the tables.

Discussion
1. Please shorten the discussion section by bout one page; it is too long.
2. The fact that you don’t have mobile numbers or emails in your database should be discussed as a weakness of your study.
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