

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| TITLE (PROVISIONAL) | Recruitment, adherence, and retention of endometrial cancer survivors in a behavioural lifestyle programme: the Diet and Exercise in Uterine Cancer Survivors (DEUS) parallel randomised pilot trial |
| AUTHORS | Koutoukidis, Dimitrios; Beeken, Rebecca; Manchanda, Ranjit; Michalopoulou, Moscho; Burnell, Matthew; Knobf, Tish; Lanceley, Anne |

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| REVIEWER | Hannah Arem George Washington University Milken Institute School of Public Health, USA |
| REVIEW RETURNED | 20-Jun-2017 |

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| GENERAL COMMENTS | <p>survivors in a behavioural lifestyle programme: the Diet and Exercise in Uterine Cancer Survivors (DEUS) parallel randomized pilot trial</p> <p>This study clearly and thoroughly explains the feasibility of this diet and exercise trial among endometrial cancer survivors in the UK. The authors are forthcoming with challenges in the process of this trial, making a significant contribution to the literature by focusing not just on outcomes of behavior change, but also the “how” of the trial process. Only very minor changes are needed.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Although the authors cite the original protocol for details, it would be helpful to add a sentence or two in brief about how measurements and demographics were collected from participants.</p> <p>Page 7, line 156-158: how many clinicians were interviewed?</p> <p>Page 10, line 219: Authors may want to add a sentence about the 15% of enrolled participants who attended zero sessions. Can list out the reasons in the CONSORT diagram in text.</p> <p>Authors may consider collapsing sparse categories in Table 1 such as race, living arrangement, marital status to make Table 1 more concise.</p> <p>Table 1: please add units to weight and BMI</p> <p>Figure 1: may want to remove the barriers that are 0 or 1% and move to an appendix to highlight the findings that would inform a future trial. May also want to specify whether these responses were</p> |
|-------------------------|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | only from those who did not participate (were these non-eligible women or those who chose not to participate?) |
|--|--|

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| REVIEWER | Jaejoon Song The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center |
| REVIEW RETURNED | 07-Jul-2017 |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| GENERAL COMMENTS | <p>1. Analysis procedure for the qualitative measure (i.e., clinicians' view on recruitment) could be described in more detail, in one or two sentences after lines 176 and 177, before the beginning of the results section. Current description is unclear to readers unfamiliar with qualitative analysis. It would also help to note how many clinicians were interviewed.</p> <p>2. In the text, the lower and upper confidence intervals were described with a dash (e.g., 81%; 95% CI: 66%-96% on line 216) or with a comma (e.g., 95% CI: 74%, 89% on line 222). Please be consistent.</p> <p>3. Figures 1, 3, and 4 is a good visual, but tables may be a better option.</p> |
|-------------------------|---|

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

1. Two sentences have been added (lines 158-160) on the collection of measurements and demographics.
2. The number of clinicians interviewed has been added.
3. We have added a sentence to aid with clarification, including the reasons for attending zero sessions (lines 223-228).
4. Units to weight and BMI have been added.
5. Barriers that are 0% and 1% have been moved to the supplementary appendix Table S3. We converted the figure into a table as per the suggestion of the second reviewer and clarified in the table caption that the responses were from those who were eligible and declined participation.
6. A sentence on the process of the qualitative analysis has been added (line 178).
7. The confidence intervals have been corrected.
8. The figures 1, 3, and 4 were converted into tables.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| REVIEWER | Hannah Arem George Washington University, USA |
| REVIEW RETURNED | 27-Jul-2017 |

| | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| GENERAL COMMENTS | No additional comments. |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|