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Reviewer’s report:

I have a few questions/comments:

a) With regard to recruitment of participants, the greatest loss is between those invited to participate and those who respond to the invitation. Do the authors have any ideas how to increase the yield from the 13.4% they obtained? Might multiple invitations improve the response? What about methods other than, or in addition to, the use of post?

b) Inadequate standardization of the exercise program was a concern. Might more training of the instructors or being more selective in their employment have improved things? Given the difficulty in finding enough instructors, would that have been feasible?

c) I do not understand Table 2. Were the cells meant to contain something?