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Title: Characteristics of clinical trial websites: information distribution between ClinicalTrials.gov and 13 primary registries in the WHO registry network
Authors: Daisuke Ogino, Kunihiko Takahashi, Hajime Sato

Senior editor comments:
"All three reviewers mentioned a problem with the English. In any further revision, the authors should ask a native English speaker to carefully review and edit the manuscript."
Response:
The manuscript has been revised by a native English speaker.

Editorial request:
#1: Please include all author emails on your title page.
Response:
We have included all author email addresses on the title page.

Reviewer 1
Reviewer's report:
Major Compulsory Revisions
#1: Table 2. In Ref #12, it has mentioned that lay summary is an important component for clinical trial registry websites. In the discussion, “Dear et al. pointed out that the most important additional item for website users was the lay summary”. Have you considered including this component explicitly in Table 2?
Response:
We do not consider it appropriate to include this component explicitly in Table 2. Table 2 lists the items we used to assess the websites, and it was only after the assessment that we recognized the importance of including a lay summary in registries (Ref #12, #13).

#2: References: Please provide the URL for the report in reference #9
Response:
We were unable to provide the URL for the report in reference #9 because this reference was sent to us by email.
We have revised reference #9 as follows:


Minor Essential Revisions
#3: Tables 2-4. Please clarify the difference between “No” and “—” in the table footnotes instead.
Response:
We have added the following to the legend of Tables 2–4:
“Items defined as “No” encompass “not provided,” “no description,” and “no distinction”; the “—” indicates that the response is summarized in the answer of another item or could not be evaluated.

#4: Tables 3-4. Suggest adding the subtitle to the categories (e.g. multilingualization, navigation, and search in Table 3)
Response:
We have added subtitles to the multilingualization, navigation, and search categories in Table 3 and the function, communication, design, and accessibility categories in Table 4.

Reviewer 2
Reviewer's report:
#1: The supplied revisions to the manuscript (mostly) satisfy the initial reviewers’ comments. I suggested several instances where text should have been re-worded or replaced. Mostly this has not been done, but rather additional, explanatory text has been added. Whilst this is probably ok it does make the manuscript a little longer and more verbose than it really needs to be.
Additionally, there are some parts of the new text that are not grammatically correct and which need correcting by a copy editor.
Response:
We have revised the text in several instances to be clearer (e.g. changed ‘survey’ to
Reviewer 3

Reviewer's report:

#1: I reviewed the authors response to the two issues that I had raise and unfortunately I am not completely satisfied with their explanations. It seems that this is because the author's command of written English is not enough to provide clear explanation. I suggest if you decide to accept this article, make sure that English flow have been improved.

Response:

We have tried to improve the flow of English to provide clearer explanations regarding our findings. The manuscript has also been edited by a native English speaker.