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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Background
1. “Several problems with the website have been pointed out by the clinical research/trial activation committee” – is it possible to provide a reference if the problems were documented?
2. To further motivate the study, please describe the benefits of improving clinical trial websites

Methods
3. Please clarify if the checklist was completed by one or more reviewers.
4. Was the checklist created based on problems identified by the clinical research/trial activation committee, and if important components from previous studies have been included (e.g. the suggested lay summary in Ref #10 or unique identifiers). Do you think that website feature for downloading crucial information in a standardized format is also helpful?

Results
5. “Five websites facilitated easy access to clinical trial information”. Please elaborate how ‘easy access’ was determined. Are there any features that are crucial to easy access?
6. Tables 2-4: please clarify the difference between “No” and “-“.
7. Table 4: were the last two items referring to flexibility in the display format? The items seems a bit too restrictive and there could alternative ways for the same feature.

Minor Essential Revisions
8. Discussion: “excluding the 20 minimum data elements in WHO”. It is not clear what this refers to. Please give a reference.
9. Table 2-4, change “Partly yes” to “Partly”
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