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Author's response to reviews: see over
Reviewer's report:
The paper has been greatly improved.

Major point:
Although this is understandable to carry out a survey of existing websites before proposing a change in the current Japanese portal for clinical trial registration, making the review to a paper for an academic journal needs a clear message. This paper still doesn't seem to have that. Assuming that the message is "current registration sites are not easy to use for lay people and this should change", there are plenty of information that does not enforce this message and therefore to me they are unnecessary and irrelevant.

Response:
The message "current registration sites are not easy to use for lay people and this should change" has been pointed out by the clinical trial activation committee in Japan. And the problems with current registration sites have including following issues:
- Access to clinical trial result information on the internet is poor.
- Content of clinical trial result information is not user-friendly.

We have revised the reference number with providing the reference in the appropriate place.

We have also provided an extra reference #7 which addresses the issues.

Minor points:

#1: Abstract, background, line 3: "To improve current clinical trial registries, we propose that combining them with clinical information phrased in lay terms would be beneficial to other interested professionals such as journalists and clinicians, as well as the general public." does not belong to introduction

Response:
This sentence belong to the Background section:

“Therefore, to improve the JPRN portal, we suggest that the current portal be combined with clear clinical information in lay terms to assist with usability and understanding of clinical trials and other medical research (currently the portal does not focus exclusively on clinical trials, but also provides general medical information to the public) by the general public and any interested professionals [5, 6].”

#2: Abstract, background, line 7: "aimed to examine how best to provide trial-related information by determining" I am not sure if one can claim this as an aim for this paper

Response:
We have revised the sentence (Abstract, background, line 7) as follows:

“Therefore, this study aimed to examine the current pattern of distribution of clinical trial information from the primary WHO registries.”

#3: Abstract, background, line 9: "Based on the results of this assessment, we then aimed to build and evaluate a prototype of the Japan Primary Registries Network (JPRN) portal that would be easily accessible to patients and the public, while still remaining useful for professionals" does not belong to introduction

Response:
This sentence belong to the Background section:

“To determine the current pattern of distribution of clinical trial information from the WHO primary registries, an assessment needs to be conducted for each website. Based on the results of this assessment, a system prototype that could be easily accessed by patients and the general public and that would still be useful for medical professionals could be built and evaluated against the goals proposed above.”