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Reviewer’s report:

This paper aims to evaluate the impact of providing information, gratification and resident motivation on recruitment rate. This is an important issue, which is overlooked in practice. However, I have some specific comments (below) that the authors might consider.

Major comments:

1. Please refer to CONSORT statement about recommendations for reporting randomized trials. The primary outcome of this study is not clear. Reporting about descriptive statistics should be consistent, i.e. count (frequency) for categorical outcomes. In addition, the authors mentioned that there were no missing data, but the percentage of response is not 100%, and the reported total counts from questionnaires are not equal to the number of survey response.

2. Without historical data and reference, the claims in the conclusion about high recruitment rates and high percentage of residents being well information in the two clinical trials are less convincing.

3. The author compared the difference of residents' preference on trials and amount of residents being maximally motivated between the first and the second round. These outcome differences were only associated with giving soft drinks. As stated in the limitation section, lack of a baseline survey making it impossible to compare the outcomes before and after the interventions. Therefore, the effect of giving Swiss chocolate is unknown from this study. In addition, the effects of Swiss chocolate and soft drinks on the recruit rates remained unknown. So this study did not directly answer the scientific question whether "motivation to do extra work above the required clinical duties is a key factor influencing the recruitment rate".

4. Sample size, power calculations and statistical tests on the outcomes were not conducted.

Minor comments:

Page 3 line 1: grammar issue. Should be "Positive motivation techniques increase"
Page 4 line 44: grammar issue. Should be "we hypothesize"
Page 8 line 17: grammar issue. Should be "positive stimulation would increase"
Page 9 line 7: The authors confused the use of randomization tool and the method of delivering treatment assignment. Randomization tool refers to the tool that generates random treatment
assignment. It would be better to state that the method of delivering treatment assignment has been changed. First it was delivered using envelope, later it was delivered using stickers on coins.
Page 12 line 51: what does gradable motivation mean?

**Level of interest**
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

**Quality of figures**

All images and figures within the manuscript should be genuine i.e. without evidence of manipulation. No specific feature within an image may be enhanced, obscured, moved, removed, or introduced. If you have concerns about the veracity of the figures you should choose the first option below.

**Statistical review**

Is it essential that this manuscript is seen by an expert statistician? If so, please give your reasons in your report.
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