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Reviewer’s report:

This study aims to assess the screened participants in the ICARE study (a cluster-randomized controlled trial) and to evaluate the difference, if any, between: 1. Subjects who decline to participate in the intervention group compared with those who decline in the control group. 2. Subjects who are enrolled into the intervention group and those who are enrolled into the control group. 3. Subjects who decline to participate in the control group compared with those who are enrolled into the control group. The used method is chi-square. (1) This method needs to be clearly indicated in the abstract. (2) Authors find out that "uncontrolled diabetics were significantly more likely to decline participation if they were in intervention sites compared to those in control sites. What is the definition of "uncontrolled diabetes" which was used? (3) The main conclusion is that "In the ICARE study, the overall impact of selection bias and refusal to participate were minimal." How it could be, if "uncontrolled diabetics were significantly more likely to decline participation if they were in intervention sites compared to those in control sites (70.8% decline rate vs. 46.7%; chi-square, p=0.0017)." Firstly, this value is accepted as significant, and thereafter - as insignificant one? (4) Please, replace "diabetics" with "patients with diabetes" and which type of diabetes?
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