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Reviewer's report:

This is an important and interesting study that reflects on improvements that can be made to the informed consent form. Sharing such experiences is important as biobanks are developed across the world. However there are a number of issues that must be addressed.

In the background, an explanation of what is meant by successful and adversarial relationships would be good. As part of this study reflects on efforts to improve the consent form to benefit recruitment, some literature on this in the background to set the scene would be beneficial.

In the methodology section, was any software used to code and analysis the data? If so, this must be explained. In the recruitment of the real-life patients, was the consent process conducted in the waiting area? If so, how was their confidentiality protected? Regarding the recruitment of the focus group, how was their contact details obtained? Did many who were approached decline? How was the consent process conducted? Was it one-on-one where they had the opportunity to ask questions or as a group?

On page 8, line 41 it is stated that to "assess the acquaintance", however in the background where the objectives are set out it is referred to as "knowledge". Did the study seek to assess understanding, knowledge or experiences with a biobank? In this context "acquaintance" is vague. On page 13 "familiarity" is referred to instead of "acquaintance". Consistency in the aim of the study is required. On page 13, ln 42 there are no references to the other studies.

At the top of page 13 the study states that the improved consent form has increased recruitment. Yet could this not be due to the presence of someone to answer any questions? How do we know that the changes are caused by either the improved form or the recruiter? In the discussion there is a repetition on why improvements to recruitment were made on page 13 and 14. This should be restructured. It's important to reflect on both the improved form and the recruiter. More literature on this and how it links with this study would strengthen the article.

The purpose of the FGD was to improve the consent form, yet there is only a discussion of the problems with the consent form. Although the two forms are in the appendix, it would be preferable if there is some discussion on the changes made. Were changes proposed by the FGD
or did they simply critique? Furthermore how did an exploration of the three terms feed into the improved consent form? Did the FGD propose alternative wording? An in-depth discussion of the development of the improved documents would be of value to others seeking to replicate the process.

The structure of the paper requires improvement. When discussing the results, it is better to have the quotes as a separate line and not in brackets. As the participants in the focus groups have been grouped according to age and SES, it would be good to have some information at the end of each quote as to what FG the quote came from. More quotes on how participants explained the 3 phrases should be inserted. A review and restructuring of the discussion section would ensure there is no repetition and allow the authors to offer more in-depth discussion.

The section on 'real life recruitment' at pg 12 should be moved to the methodology section.

There is no formal heading for the conclusion in the main text of the paper. The declarations should go at the end of the paper. The authors should refer to BMC submission guidelines and ensure that all relevant headings are included and in the correct order.

There are a number of typographical errors throughout and a careful reading is necessary. Furthermore certain phrases such as "had been approved ethically" and "increasing knowledge came more enthusiasm to join" should be rewritten. All references should be in brackets and at the end of the sentence.
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