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Reviewer's report:

The objective of the present study is identify the specific motivators that inspire Brazilian volunteers to participate in clinical studies and to describe the demographic profile of these study subjects. The authors conducted a study that they described as mixed methods to achieve these objectives.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The study design is unusual at best. Typically qualitative data are not "quantified" and then statistically analyzed. The authors should cite some sort of reputable source indicating that this is an acceptable practice.

2. The introduction leaves out a lot of international literature of studies which have assessed clinical trial participants' motivation for taking part in a study.

3. Has there been other research in Brazil assessing clinical trial participants' motivation for participating in trials. This should be summarized or indicated.

4. It is surprising that the names and contact information of participants in clinical trials were shared with the researchers for the present study. In many places, this would be considered a breach of confidentiality and privacy.

5. The key informants were participants in the present study but seem to be treated in a different way. Were they consented? Why are no demographic data presented for them? Were they administered the same interview script? Were they compensated?

6. How was the sample size determined? Was there any consideration of saturation? It is not clear if the sample size of 10 key informants is sufficient to make comparisons between the key informants and clinical trial participants.

7. The "survey script" seems unusual as it seems to be a combination of a self-report survey and an in-depth interview. Were participants asked closed ended questions (age) by the interviewer or did they complete a self-report survey.

8. Were interviews audio or video taped? Were they transcribed verbatim? The language in which the interview was conducted should be mentioned. The procedure for translating the data into English should be described.

7. The analysis of the data indicates that content analysis was done, but it is not clear if this was done for all of the data, like age?

8. One limitation that isn't mentioned is the lack of participation of people who had declined to participate in a trial. By only including participants the
researchers only have half of the story.

9. The analysis of the qualitative data is questionable. In the "access to healthcare" section, the authors indicate that that motivator was only mentioned by key informants, but this theme was clearly mentioned by participants in the "Financial compensation" section and the "altruism" section.

10. The analyses looking at associations between demographic characteristics and types of trial participation does not add much to our knowledge base or understanding of why people participate in trials. I would delete it.

11. The writing of the paper could be improved. There are a lot of one sentence paragraphs, which make reading the study difficult.

Discretionary Revisions

1. The authors mention that most had an "average education." Most readers will not understand what that means.

2. The authors describe the socioeconomic status of the participants using letters. It is not clear which letters are high and which are low until the discussion section.

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

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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