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Dear Editors

Re: MS 5969256919305875-Reflecting on the methodological challenges of recruiting to a
UK-wide multi-centre randomised controlled trial.

Thank you again for the opportunity to submit a revised manuscript.

As requested, all changes are highlighted in track changes and we have provided a point-by-
point response to all raised concerns.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully

Sylvia Dickson
**Manuscript reference number:** 5969256919305875

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ursula Bowler Comments</th>
<th>Authors’ response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Minor issues not for publication</td>
<td>Thank you for highlighting this. It has now been removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st paragraph in Discussion - There is a random 'r' in the text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridget Young Comments</th>
<th>Authors’ response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The authors appear to have revised the article to address my previous comments. However, I could only access the 'clean' version of the revised manuscript and not the track changes version (showing the revisions made), which made it difficult to identify exactly where the changes had been made. It would be helpful if the track changes versions of manuscripts could be made available to reviewers.</td>
<td>Apologies for submitting the clean version of the revised manuscript. This was done in error. We hope it is now clear where changes have been made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are a few very small typos and formatting errors in the revised manuscript which will need to be addressed.</td>
<td>Hopefully these have all now been corrected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usha Menon Comments</th>
<th>Authors’ response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have reviewed the resubmitted manuscript and the response to all referees comments. The paper reads much better and the limitations of the narrative style are clearly stated.</td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>