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Reviewer's report:

This is a novel study of qualitative and quantitative/meta analysis of valuable data, which are hardly available together. In that regard, authors' work provided a great service to the field.

Specific questions:

* What is the authors' final message? I personally think some trick is acceptable or even called for as long as meeting requirements on ethics.

* One author generously provided 2 PILs. Are they for different studies, not just different versions for the same study? Also, these studies are indicated in Supplement?

Editorial questions:

1. In Abstract, "..PILs which…" is grammatically correct?

2. P. 8: Authors may want to state how "test for subgroup differences" was done?

3. P. 10, middle: "When the number….. 1 to 1 and 2 to 1…” is confusing; authors may clarify.

4. P. 11: t-test for real and MW test for placebo?

5. P. 12: In "When BI values… significance", English is long and hard to follow.

6. P. 13: "in large"?

7. P. 14: line -4: "limits"?

8. P. 18: What is "reasonable" request?

9. In table 1’s footnote, it may be indicated: "Unblinded" generally means "More correct guess" as unblinded is a simple but strong term.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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