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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Given this is a RCT, I would strongly recommend that the authors access the CONSORT statement and use this as a guide to report key elements of their trial. Many elements are currently missing in relation to the methods, reporting of results and discussion. Examples include – the fact this is an RCT is not in title, details of the specific population, details of randomization (allocation concealment), who implemented randomization, sample size calculation, participant flow diagram and limitations.

Methods - Within the methods data that is more suited to the results are presented (e.g. number of participants, etc). Please can the authors re-edit the manuscript accordingly?

Results - More details of those who responded n=199 compared to those who did not should be provided.

Results - Were there any other demographic or clinical characteristics associated with participants responding?

Results - A study flow diagram, a table summarizing the sample and results would be helpful.

Results - The authors have found that a personalized invitation to their RCT resulted in a higher response rate. How many of these participants then went to on consent and participate in the RCT. I feel this information would be useful for other planning similar RCTs.

Discretionary Revisions

Introduction - The use of personalized invitations has been shown in other studies to improve response and recruitment rates, the current study is not the first to do this. Could the authors perhaps frame why their specific population (breast cancer survivors) would be harder to reach than other groups previously studied in this same context?
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