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Reviewer’s report:

Reviewer’s report: The current study provide us with the statistical proof that the number of randomized industry sponsored HIV and hepatitis C studies, registered in Clinical Trials.gov, is not significantly different than the non-industry sponsored ones.

Comments and major compulsory revisions.

1) Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

Question is not new. It is well defined in the introduction section, especially in the last paragraph. Unfortunately, the authors limited their analysis to a small percentage of industry sponsored and non-sponsored studies. Consequently, in my opinion, the authors in the background section should insist more on the current knowledge of positive or negative influence of industry sponsorship in infectious diseases studies (especially HIV and hepatitis C) and better justify the selection of HIV and hepatitis C studies.

2) Are the methods appropriate?

Methodology is simple, acceptable.

3) Data control and deposition

Data are presented in a descriptive and understandable way. But, in multivariate analysis, the non-statistically significant, in the univariate analysis variables, presence of a data monitoring committee as well as exclusion of persons older than age 65 were included and sample size though statistically significant in the univariate was excluded. I believe that it is important for the authors to justify this selection or correct it. Also, I think that wherever significant PR are presented, “p” should also be added.

4) Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

In my opinion, the discussion should concentrate more on the most important results of the study, especially on the first paragraph, and comment on the influence of industry sponsorship on the elaboration of HIV and hepatitis C trials, primarily.
5) Do the title and abstract convey what has been found?

The title corresponds to what is described in the study.
In general, the abstract conveys the authors’ ideas, but the choice of HIV and hepatitis C studies should be more emphasized. The results section must be better written, as in its current form is not understandable.

Minor Essential Revisions, if necessary, will be mentioned in the next review.
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