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Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary Revisions

1. Page 5, line 14: better to put: "cost data collection in clinical trials can be burdensome and can increase both the costs..."

2. Page 5, line 20: can additional references to trials involving patient recall in Germany and the US be included here as reference 8, although relevant, involves reference to UK clinical trials.

3. Page 6, line 2: it would be useful if the authors could quote one or two references supporting the statement "...unlikely that participants will complete all diaries"; alternatively state whether this is something they, too, have observed in the course of their own studies.

4. Page 15, line 16-18: useful to mention here that patient report on hospital stays could be cross-validated against electronic hospital records where these exist.

5. The 'health warning' on lines 27 (p.16) and 1 to 6 (p.17) [Applying incomplete...TO ...or literature research] ought to be placed in the conclusion as well.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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