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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Thank you for the insightful comments. We have revised our original manuscript, and have addressed comments made by the reviewers.

Please find comments by the reviewers below, with responses in bold.

Reviewer: 1

1. Lines 102-103: Could you put these studies into context? What did they find?

   Added, “Namely, these works have suggested that higher levels of evidence and greater degrees of transparency in reporting for randomized control trials (RCTs) exist in higher impact clinical journals.”

2. Line 170: CONSORT isn't intended to assess risk of bias, it's to guide transparency in reporting.

   Changed to, “for their transparency of reporting.”

3. Line 270: I’m still unclear on why a subset of CONSORT items was used. How did you determine which were the "most important" measures?

   Added, “Namely, these are measures that are easily identified by the reading public, and more importantly, a subset of minimum guidelines that the CONSORT group has identified for use in quickly and efficiently assessing transparency in reporting.”

4. Overall, this manuscript would benefit from further proof-reading/editing to ensure that the messages are clear and to improve flow.

   Please feel free to make any proof-reading/editing changes. The authors’ have gone through the article.

Reviewer: 2

Nil

We welcome any further comments/suggestions and thank you for your time.

The authors