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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
The questions posed by the authors are new and well defined. The aim of the study is very interesting.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
The methods are appropriate but there are two problems.

1. One and very important source of data was not included into the study – TUKIJA (central Finnish REC – which access multicenter clinical trials only). It may falsify the whole data especially when someone would like to obtain the true proportion of different types of research in Finland. But it is not necessary to evaluate data from TUKIJA in all parts of the article. But basic information about the type and number of research studies evaluated by TUKIJA is crucial.

2. I cannot understand why comparison is based on 2002 and 2007 but not 2010. The authors present data collected in 2002 and 2007 only – but now is 2013!

The description of methods is correct.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
Yes they are but we are still lacking data from TUKIJA. It corrupt the whole project and the authors should try to obtain the exact number of multicenter clinical trials which should be added to the whole number of studies conducted in Finland in 2002 and 2007. If it will not be done proportions of different types of studies should not be presented. More detailed analysis might be presented without TUKIJA data, but data from Table 1 should not be presented without TUKIJA data.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes it does.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The discussion and conclusions should include the data which are not presented in the study (TUKIJA). It is the main problem of this study.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes.
7. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes it is.

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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