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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have revised the manuscript thoroughly and followed most suggestions of both reviewers. The readability has improved majorly and the key message gets more attention. The article can raise awareness and provoke discussion in its field.

Minor comments;

Page 4; only one explanation mark?

Page 6; please be careful with the use of attention marks in an article.

Discretionary Revisions;

Page 5; suggest adding information about relatively recent development. The new law in the US requires not only registration of trials but also that researchers enter results into the database. We can be cautiously optimistic that this law may be having an effect on publication bias. Reference: Tuma RS. “New law may be having some effect on publication bias”. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2010 Mar 3;102(5):290-2. Epub 2010 Feb 19.

Page 6; the authors’ plea for legislation can be sharpened, because unfortunately legislation is also not a solid solution. It depends on the consequences when you are entering the law. As mentioned on page 3, despite legislation (FDAMA 113) many drug trials were not registered in the US. What can we learn from this? What was the mean reason for the fact that registrations did not followed from this Act?
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