This paper poses and (at least partially) answers a relevant question to any trialist: What type of trial management is preferable for a multicentre trial we want to undertake? Which is better for this specific trial: management of all trial aspects by a central trial coordinator, or by local study coordinators?

The authors have compared some important parameters to gain further insight in this issue:
- data on the trial initiation process,
- data on the pre-trial period,
- data on the trial period itself, such as startup time, inclusion rate, follow-up completeness
- some financial aspects
These data are well recorded and analyzed accordingly.

However, although the conclusion at first hand appears to be quite in favor of trial management by a central trial coordinator, I believe the interpretation of these data should be very careful. Unfortunately, there are a lot of confounding factors in this study: finances, geography, legal and ethical aspects, and maybe most of all socio-cultural aspects. The authors mention this and deal with these factors (although rather superficially) at the end of the discussion. Therefore, I think their conclusion is carefully put and with sufficient nuance.

I think the paper is well worth publishing.
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