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Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

I have only two minor suggestions. As there is no limitation in the journal, please describe briefly the constraining method of your previous paper (in Stat Med 2005). Second, the figures for trials with 100 to 300 subjects do not allow to see anything; please, change the scale (the maximum and minimum point of axes x & y). I'm aware that the current format allows the comparison with smaller trials, but this would not be any inconvenience for any careful reader (and the paper is for readers with a substantial knowledge on statistics).

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

None

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.