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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting and well written study into determinants of participation in research by hepatologists and gastroenterologists. Concerning specific questions:
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes, essentially it is a combination of direct questions and responses to virtual proposals which seems adequate for answering the question.
3. Are the data sound?
   Yes, datamanagement and analysis are OK
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   I would prefer the authors to be more concise, especially in results and discussion session: please stay with the major findings and start the discussion with a short summary of the most important findings answering the research question posed in the introduction.
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   I wouldn't primarily conclude that there is a gap in US research structure as the authors do, this cannot be derived from the data directly. And this conclusion is not the most interesting kind of conclusion for readers in other parts of the world. What is worrying is that physicians rather consequently seem to decide on the level of payment (although it is being presented as a means to being able to arrange research support) in stead of judgment of clinical relevance. It confirms the mechanisme that pharmaceutical companies will go on determining the research agenda, because they are in the position to pay more. I would have liked the authors to elaborate a bit more on that aspect - establishing a research structure is only one of the solutions that can be thought of.
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes they are.
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes they do

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
I don’t think this manuscript is really on attitudes, more directly it is on determinants of participation.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
I would prefer the authors to shorten methods and results section and elaborate on the discussion.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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