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Reviewer's report:

Well written paper on the added value of treatment effect estimate INCLUDING their confidence intervals over simple reporting of p-values and considering effectiveness as something black-and-white. No errors in the paper, but obviously this message is not new. Nor is the remark that a p-value of 0.05 is rather arbitrary. What this paper adds is that there are three well chosen examples, that are nicely worked-out. A nice way to revitalize the discussion on p-values vs. a somewhat more nuanced view on effectiveness. I really agreed with the authors.

Major revisions:
None

Minor essential revisions:
What I missed in the paper is that there is no attention for the role of editors / reviewers in the way results are written down. Or even rewriting by journal editorial teams (as is common in the general medicine papers). Obviously, some journals have taken a more nuanced point of view more recently and that should be mentioned in the paper, I guess.

Another issue that needs some attention is the role of regulators (e.g., FDA, EMA) in this, and how they stick to the magical statistical significance level of 0.05.
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