Peer Review Report

Review Report on To remind or not to remind during recruitment? An analysis of the HeReCa online panel

Original Article, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Stefan Essig
Submitted on: 13 Dec 2023
Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2024.1606770

EVALUATION

Q 1 **Please summarize the main findings of the study.**

A single postal invitation for population-based panels seems justified.

Q 2 **Please highlight the limitations and strengths.**

Generalizability is lmited by language, country, year, and topic of the panel. The study has been well conducted. Studies on panel design and reminder management are potentially important for many other research groups.

Q 3 **Please provide your detailed review report to the authors. The editors prefer to receive your review structured in major and minor comments. Please consider in your review the methods (statistical methods valid and correctly applied (e.g. sample size, choice of test), is the study replicable based on the method description?), results, data interpretation and references. If there are any objective errors, or if the conclusions are not supported, you should detail your concerns.**

Line 16: "Although reminders at recruitment increase participation, their gain is limited in low-participation settings." What are low-participation settings? Introduce the settings in the abstract or drop that part of the conclusion. Refer to the conclusion in the body text, which is a better version of the conclusion.

Line 93: The process in terms of switching to email after letter and reminder letter is unclear to me. Was the email the second reminder? Or was it another questionnaire with different content? Consider adding a figure to visualize the process.

Line 124: "We spent about 18 Euro and 28 Euro (+56%) for the recruitment..." is not much information consindering the rather detailed assessment of costs. Add more information. Consider adding a table.

Line 131: "...showed significant differences between the two groups." Specify the direction and effect size of the association.

Table 2: You present the retained fractions in %. Therefore, "Active withdrawal..." in the title of the table is misleading. Use the information between brackets as title of the table.

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4 **Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?**

Yes

Q 5 **Are the keywords appropriate?**

Yes

Q 6 Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes

Q 7 Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

No.

Q 8 Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?)

Yes

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 9	Originality	■■□□□
Q 10	Rigor	■■■□□
Q 11	Significance to the field	■■■□□
Q 12	Interest to a general audience	■■■□□
Q 13	Quality of the writing	■■■□□
Q 14	Overall scientific quality of the study	■■■□□

REVISION LEVEL

Q 15 Please make a recommendation based on your comments:

Minor revisions.