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Reviewer’s report:

This is an offshoot of the authors’ 2011 paper in which the authors examined the quality of registration of clinical trials. They now report information on blinding in these trials. I have no major feedback to offer except to note that trials protocols do contain more information on methodological quality (including blinding) than publications of the same trials [see Mhaskar R et al : Published methodological quality of randomized controlled trials does not reflect the actual quality assessed in protocols. J Clin Epidemiol 2012, 65(6):602-609.] It is, therefore, quite possible that the same is true for registries: research protocols probably include more information on blinding than registries themselves. This should be discussed; I also think that the research protocols should be mandatory part of trials registry (as minimal data requirement cannot capture all nuances of research protocols).

I found fascinating the size of OR (719!) for reporting information as discrete vs. free-text field. It has tremendous implication for development of research databases.

Minor point:

Table does not include any information on blinding of analysts while Figure does. I thought that the information used to construction of table and figure is the same-so this should be reconciled.

This is really it.

Ben djulbegovic
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