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Reviewer's report:

1. Will the study design adequately test the hypothesis?
   I do not think that it will. There will be lots of confounding which will be practically impossible to allow for. At the very least, I would have expected to see concurrent controls. Surely the investigators should be comparing recruitment rates with trials reported by the same journals over the same period, with 1:1 randomisation.

   I cannot understand rationale for differences in thresholds for unequal randomisation dependent on trial size. The focus should be on the planned ratio, not that actually achieved (which may be influenced by trial size).

   If the protocol cannot be revised then a minimum requirement might be a discussion of the problems raised above.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests:

I have no competing interests.