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Reviewer's report:

I'm happy with the responses of the authors and I agree that we disagree regarding some issues.

However, I'm still struggling with my lack of familiarity with the label "mITT". In the methods section the authors define extensively what they consider adequate randomisation, concealment, etc. The only issue that they don’t seem to define is when they consider ITT as proper ITT or mITT. For their most important item they refer to their BMJ paper. To me, it is a missed opportunity to not inform ignorant readers like me properly. I leave it to your consideration whether or not you will try to help me understand your paper even better. You also may wish to include the box text in the results section (or present those results in a Table).
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