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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revisions:
1. The purpose of this paper is to “compare objective and subjective efficiency of pCRF and eCRF use in clinical studies”, but in fact, the research studies collected in the paper were sponsored by the Paris regional hospital consortium AP-HP. So, the results are representativeness?

2. This is a retrospective study and how to implement the quality control during the process of survey? Moreover, how to judge the quality of responded questionnaires?

Minor Essential Revision:
1. All the tables in the paper should modify to three-line tables.

Level of interest: An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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