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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Please define acronyms before you use them first time, e.g. CTIMPs, isrctn, EudraCT, Hpss, NHS.....
2. Data Analysis - Please add MedCalc version number used
3. Line 178- why the need to mention subgroup analysis? If the outcome was the same? Subgroup analysis explains the results, should not be considered an outcome.
4. Line 178- why the need to mention subgroup analysis? If the outcome was the same? Subgroup analysis explains the results, should not be considered an outcome. This makes me question the outcomes you measured. An additional table with these could perhaps be provided as supplementary materials.
5. Lines 214-218 should be in results first.
6. Line 183 proportion of unreported outcomes per study was 38%. Please provide 95% CI for the Median
7. There was no correlation between the number of papers a study produced and the percentage of reported outcomes. (please list the range of p values for correlations or provide them in supplementary tables)
8. Correlation between the number of outcomes and the percentage of reported outcomes. As above
9. Line 222 -223 Add here a range as in line 197
10. In my previous review I have listed as discretionary recommendations the need for expanding the intro and discussion sections, including newest version of Declaration of Helsinki and sys reviews of publication bias. There however I feel are mandatory to compare your results with the current knowledge of the field.
11. Please add limitations about the generalisability of the results based upon the small sample size and the fact you did not contact the authors.

Discretionary Revisions

1. Abstract - Suggest removing from the conclusions:
The data gathered by this project, as well as the method described here and rephrasing the sentences that contain them
2. Intro - suggest deleting:
In this paper we report our findings and argue that as a national body, the HRA is well placed to monitor reporting bias. Just state the hypothesis, the argument can be left in the discussion.
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