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Thank you very much for the revised submission, which addresses many of my comments. I've some more points to raise below, many of which are minor and some of which are in response to substantial new sections of content in your paper. I hope everything is clearly explained.

- I have now read through the abstract (clean copy only), and have the following comments
  
  ○ The sentence beginning 'We hypothesize…' does not read well - the reader gets lots at 'resident motivation' - is that part of the list of things with 'continuous information and gratification'? If so, it should have an 'and' before it; if not, it needs rewording.

  ○ Suggest the Background is written in the past tense as you have already done the work ('we hypothesized...that recruitment rates would improve')

  ○ The abstract should, like the main text, make clear that the soft drink machine is just for delivery of the randomisation result.

  ○ 'Reward' may be a more suitable word than 'recompensate'

  ○ Sentence beginning 'Randomization of these trials…' - the words 'was used' at the end are too far from their object - suggest amend to 'later a soft drink machine was used'.

  ○ Suggest 'to increase interest, everyone received Swiss chocolate' should be its own sentence. At the moment the reader may well read 'to increase interest' as referring to the trial information bit just before that.

  ○ Suggest you could remove 'specially designed'.

  ○ '(either categorical or scaled from 0 to 10)' could be removed - it seems too much detail for the abstract (and doesn't actually help understand exactly what your survey covered - for that, I think people need to read the paper).

  ○ Results - 'median 9 (7;9)' - we might presume the other numbers are interquartile range, but they aren't labelled as such - suggest this is made totally clear.
○ 'The categorical rated motivation' is not clear. I think this specifically refers to the proportion of people saying they did not feel they could be more motivated than they were. (I think it's important to be clear and specific about this, as it's not quite the same as people saying they were highly motivated, though we could interpret it that way.)

○ 'The recruitment rates ranged from 72 to 90%'. This is not clear. It could be interpreted in a number of ways, e.g. range of all monthly recruitment figures - I think you should be more specific, and also present something that is relevant to the argument your paper is making.

○ '24% of residents stated to be motivated by the gratifications.' I think it would be more true to say that 24% agreed that their motivation could be increased through receiving gratifications. (It is a slight problem with the survey that this could be interpreted in different ways - perhaps somewhat depending on the native language of the respondents - as either 'my motivation can be increased AND has been...' vs 'my motivation could in theory be increased if I were to receive more gratifications...' - but best to report it in line with the questions that were asked)

○ Conclusion: this claim seems too strong (as the previous draft of the paper was). I wonder if words like 'suggests' might be better.

- Introduction, paragraph 3: thank you, this now reads more clearly. However, a couple of remaining things: 1) it should say 'possible reasons given were...' - it currently says 'where' instead of 'were', and 2) in the same sentence, the point about lack of benefit is clearer now, but I suggest even clearer still would be to say 'due to a perceived lack of benefit for the resident'. I think it's the perception that is the important point.

- Introduction, p5 in tracked copy - 'Our hypothesis is...' - I had suggested this change to 'was', and you had agreed, but it hasn't changed in the copy I'm looking at.

- Introduction, final paragraph - thanks for clarifying some aspects of this - the sentence starting 'Consequently' is now very long, however, and pretty hard to take in. You might consider dropping some of the newly-added words if they are covered in the Methods. Otherwise, please re-work this all so it is clearer, splitting the sentence up if need be.

- It's OK to use the abbreviation 'ED', but you should use the full words the first time the term is used, which I think is early in the Methods section

- Methods, Trial One - I have some suggestions for the new sentence at the start: 1) the first sentence should start 'The goal...'; 2) 'an easier' should be changed to the adverbial 'more easily'; 3) the indefinite article (a/an) is probably not required there nor in the last part of the sentence as I suspect 'wound care' is an uncountable noun in English; 4) a suggestion only, but the last few words might read more naturally as 'a shorter period of time off work'.

- Methods, Trial One - some suggestions for the new content starting 'Simple 1:1 randomization': 1) I think the first 5 words could be their own sentence; 2) I think 'initially' or 'at first' might be better than 'first', and there should be a comma after this or else it can be confusing (I initially read as if you were talking about the first randomisation); 3) on the third line I think
should be the word 'envelopes', not 'enveloped'; 4) 'collected' instead of 'collect'; 5) 'were prepared', not 'where prepar'd'; 6) 'described', not 'desirbed'

- Trial One - additional work of 15 minutes' - your changes have helped, but I think you can only use 'measured' if you say how you measured it - it seems like 'estimated' might be better. If it really was measured, please briefly clarify how.

- Trial Two - suggest you add 'the' to the start of this first sentence ('the aim…')

- Trial Two - 'where less extensive' should be 'were less extensive'

- Trial Two - 'Again 1:1 randomization was used' - you should mention this was simple randomisation if that is the case.

- Trial Two - 'describerd' should be 'described'

- Trial Two - sentence starting 'The mentioned…' - add 'the' before 'operation' and 'background'

- 3.2 - minor correction required: 'to participate in a trial' rather than 'at a trial'

- Methods, section 'Soft drinks' - this is already a lot clearer than before. However - just trying to be totally clear - you've described soft drink cans which were 'filled randomly into the...machine', which sounds like it was done by humans, who are prone to bias. Did a truly random method define the order of the cans?

- Methods, Soft drinks section - 'Timeline…' should be 'The timeline'; and in the same sentence, should be 'displayed' not 'display'; 'figure 2' should probably be 'Figure 2'

- 3.4 - the paper now has lots of detail about what was in the survey, but I wonder if this could be reduced (if the detail is all in the Figure/attachment)

- Figure 3 - this is clearly a screenshot and has a little tooltip/help text box visible on it covering question 7. I'd suggest it would be better as an attached Word/PDF document, but if it needs to be an image, make sure it is the best quality it can be.

- Statistics - you should be clear where this is referring to the survey analysis rather than anything else (e.g. recruitment rates)

- Statistics - thanks for the clarification (in your replies) to the questions of what is prospective and what is post hoc. I was thinking in terms of the survey itself, and the analysis of the survey - was any of the analysis plan developed before you launched the survey? Or was it all done once you had the results? Clarification in the paper would be helpful.

- Statistics - regarding my previous comment on the 0.05 p-value threshold - sorry if I was not clear. My understanding is that this can be used as a reasonable threshold for an unlikely result - something that is unlikely enough that there is a less than 1/20 chance of it happening by chance. But if you run, say, 20 or more tests, then it becomes increasingly likely that your unlikely result
HAS happened by chance, as you have many tests. So you can design your experiment around a primary outcome and only really look at the p-value associated with that, or - if you want to do many tests, you can adjust for the multiplicity (by using a lower threshold for significance) or, as may apply best here, use the p-values only in an exploratory sense (to show what looks to be an unlikely result). If you use this third approach, you are unlikely to be able to use your results to make any strong claims. I think it would be useful to explain your approach a little more: if you are trying to make a definitive claim, then say which outcome measure is your primary; if you adjusted for multiplicity, say how; or if this is all exploratory and you won't try to make definitive claims, make this clear.

- Results: thank you for clarifying that the groups completing the first and second surveys were not the same. This is somewhat clearer in the manuscript now (with the addition to the methods). However, I think you should make clear that it was not possible to link individuals' results in the two surveys (I appreciate this is mentioned in Discussion, but I think it should be in Methods as well). If it's possible to estimate the proportion of people invited to complete the second survey who had also been invited to complete the first, this might be useful to know (i.e. so we can tell if they are the same group or a totally different group or something in between).

- Results - '[Question 2] was answered unanimously' - this would indicate every single person gave the same answer. Is this the case? The result you report is that everyone said "performing clinical trials...are necessary for ... clinical improvement as a doctor', but this isn't one of the multiple choice answers. I suggest you report a more precise result here, i.e. report the percentage of respondents giving particular answer(s).

- Results, new paragraph beginning 'Missing data...' - suggest the last sentence could be re-worded to '...that less scientifically motivated colleagues might have chosen not to complete the survey.'

- Results, new heading 'Where the trials acknowledged...' should be 'Were...'.

- Results: thank you for clarifying the section on reasons for preferring one or the other of the trials. I note you have not reported the number who said they preferred the trial because of the free soft drinks - though this seems core to your manuscript. Might you add this?

- Results: the section on motivation is clearer, thank you. However, Figure 6 is a bit difficult to interpret. I think there are different numbers in the 1st and 2nd period columns, so I think you should make clear the denominator in each. I am also not sure why the 'no increase' answers are in this illustration of reasons for increase in motivation, as these are presented in Figure 5 (aren't they? If not, then I'm not sure what 'no increase' means here).

- Results, section on motivation: 'Interestingly, this number dropped'. It didn't - it remained constant (7 in first round, 7 in second), but the proportion did drop.

- Results, 'Did the trials run...' - add 'The' before the start of the paragraph '...inclusion period of trial one...'
Discussion: 'Only few studies exist on trial recruitment' - I'm not sure this is true - is the intended meaning that there are only a few studies like yours, looking at motivating hospital staff?

Discussion: you say recruitment rates in surgical trials may be less than 50%, but the reference is from 2006. Is there anything more recent? If not, might you soften this claim a bit?

Discussion: new text on p20 of the tracked change version, a sentence beginning 'Regarding out data' I think should say 'Regarding our data…'

Discussion, sentence 'It should be mentioned…' - suggest splitting this sentence after 'participate in a trial' - it is otherwise too long and the clauses are not correctly linked.

Conclusion: I'm not sure what is meant by 'loosening of the randomization process' - this might not be the right word, as it suggests not controlling randomisation as tightly.

You seem to have accepted my comments on Table 1, but the version I have still shows the previous issues -perhaps you have already uploaded a new version of this (please ignore this comment if so)
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