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Reviewer’s report:

General

The authors have extensively revised this paper, and I think it is much improved for the revisions. I congratulate them.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

None.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

P3, line 4th from bottom: "This could indicate that the latter risk measures are difficult to comprehend" - should read "This could indicate that these risk measures are..."

P7, line 2 "Consent was ... not present if the subject rejected the treatment or meant too little information was given" should read "if the subject rejected the treatment or stated too little information was given".

P10, line 3. Mislead should be "misled"
P10, line 5, insert "than" between rather and information.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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