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Dear Editors of Trials,

Thank you for your continued consideration of our manuscript, entitled “A cross-sectional analysis of HIV & hepatitis C clinical trials 2007-2010: The relationship between industry sponsorship and randomized study design” for publication in Trials. We appreciate the time and effort the reviewers and editors put into the manuscript and have performed major revisions in response to their comments. We have responded to reviewer comments line-by-line below and tracked changes in the revised manuscript:

Reviewer #1:

Line 292-293: I think that the phrase "Different sponsors, for example, may have defined "randomisation" differently." is ambiguous and it should either be omitted or better explained.

We have omitted this sentence.

Reviewer #2:

The authors need to note whether clinicaltrials.gov allows them to assess the strength of the randomization process. If it does this should be included in their analysis. If it doesn’t then they should note this as a limitation to their study.

The clinicaltrials.gov registry does not allow us to assess strength of the randomization process, and we have added this as a limitation to the analysis.

Sincerely,

Neela Goswami, MD