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Reviewer's report:

Second re-review of manuscript "Deficiencies in the transfer and availability of clinical trials evidence: a survey of existing systems and standards".

The authors have made an impressive effort in tightening up, simplifying and focussing their manuscript. In my opinion the text now represents a potentially useful contribution and should be published.

I have only a few minor comments:

Title:
I find it a bit odd to label the study as a "survey" in the title (and not anywhere else in the text, I believe). I suggest using "review" rather than "survey" in the title.

Abstract:
I would delete "all" in the first sentence in the conclusion - sounds a bit too categorical.

Section 3.1:
The first sentence in the last para is a bit hard to understand (for me), since "incomplete trial reporting and publication bias" does not necessarily follow logically from the "fact that clinical trial results were only published in scientific journals" - does it?

Section 3.3:
I would change "In contrast to the traditional journal publications, which usually...." to "In contrast to the traditional journal publications of systematic reviews, which usually..." (Just to make it crystal clear).

4.1:
"None of the general purpose data models being developed is..." should be changed to " None of the general purpose data models being developed are..."
"the perceived lack of transparency in regulatory decision making has eroded public trust in drug regulation and the pharmaceutical industry". This statement should probably be either backed by a reference or toned down a little bit (do you really know this for a fact or have good reason to believe that this is the case?)

Again, I am impressed by the extent to which the authors have heeded to the reviewers' comments, and of how good the final text ended up being.
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