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Reviewer's report:

Re-review: “Quality of reporting of randomized controlled trial in major gastroenterology and hepatology journals in 2008 and in 1998: a comparative study”

The reviewers modified the manuscript according to some of the comments. In the response to reviewers’ document, they did not answer the comments point by point but only stated “we have revised in our studies”. It would have been interesting to have detailed answers for some of the comments.

1) The authors did not distinct clearly reporting and adequacy. They tried to re-formulate their objective that is to assess the adequacy of methodological items as it is reported in the reports of RCTs but the definitions provided in Table 1 are derived from the CONSORT Statement and did not allow for evaluating adequacy. Adequacy should be assessed using the definitions provided in the Cochrane Handbook about domains of the Risk of Bias (ROB) tool. Methods and results should be in line with the objective.

2) It would be interesting to report whether the journals assessed adhered to CONSORT and if yes, when.

3) I did not have access to Appendix 1.

4) The second reviewer was interested in the secondary analyses presented in the results according to funding and to single-center or multicenter status. What makes me more doubtful is that these analyses were not pre-specified as a secondary objective and in the methods in the previous version. These are secondary analyses and should not be presented as the main results in the discussion.

5) The authors should compare their results to the previous methodological reviews performed in the field. In my previous review, I mentioned the following articles: Gluud C, 1998, J Hepatology; Kjaergard LL, 1999, hepatology, Kjaergard LL, 2002, Gastroenterology; Kjaergard LL, 2002, Am J Gastroenterology,…) and the recent of paper by Sally Hopewell in the BMJ should also be discussed.

6) Why did the authors perform OR as, to my knowledge it was not asked? Table 3 is hard to understand. I would omit OR for adequacy vs non adequacy. For Table 4: I would indicate for single-center and multicenter and funding source what ORs represents i.e. single vs multi; industry vs public. Presentation of Table 4 is not homogeneous with either ORs and F and p-values.
7) The flow chart should present double entry according to the year of publication for all selection steps

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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