Reviewer's report

Title: If you build it, will they come? A randomized controlled trial of mail vs. telephone invitation to a community-based cardiovascular health awareness program

Version: 2 Date: 21 April 2005

Reviewer: Marshall Godwin

Reviewer's report:

General
A straightforward study done in preparation for a larger study. It compares postal mail with telephone as a recruiting strategy. It is an RCT. There are no major issues with the design. A common practice is mail followed by telephone which was not tested.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

On page 8 it says 235 patients were found on the electronic roster. In Figure 1 it says 490. I think the number in the text should be 490 and the final number after exclusion should be 235.

Figure 1 shows 255 patients being excluded. This is a very high proportion. What is the explanation?

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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