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Reviewer's report:

The paper describes recruitment and retention strategies from the INC intervention study. The paper is well written and well structured. Recruitment and retention are major challenges in many trials and having effective strategies to improve recruitment and retention are crucial. It is therefore an important subject. The paper contributes to the literature, although the experiences and results are purely descriptive.

I only have a few comments:

Abstract: Can you conclude anything on which strategies were the most effective?

Reference 14 is the study protocol. Is there a published paper on results from the project?

L 174 inclusion criteria. It is very confusing how you can change BMI percentile from 85 to 5. The study is about obese children. Is it correct that when you change the criteria to percentile 5 most of the children that you recruit for the study do not have any problems with their weight and might even by underweight? Or am I misunderstanding something? Table 2 shows that almost 50% are normal BMI class. Is there a risk that the strategies used to recruit children with normal weight to a study aimed at overweight children may not work the same way with overweight children?

Table 2: Girls constitute 60% of the study sample. Can you discuss why this may be? And is this a problem? Do you need strategies to recruit more boys?

Table 2: are the children who participate in the study different to the general population living in the area where recruitment took place?

Table 3 and 5 - is it somehow possible to evaluate which strategies worked well and which did not?

Discussion and conclusion: It would be nice if you could be a bit clearer on which strategies worked well and which did not - are there specific strategies that you can recommend? Are there
other strategies that could have worked? And some that did not work at all or maybe even made it worse?

Thank you - I enjoyed reading the paper
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