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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting debate; I disagree with some of the points made, but by no means all of them

Discretionary revisions:

1. Sometimes a very didactic statement is made (can not; does not; etc) where this gives a hostage to fortune - a single counter argument and the whole claim falls. A softer "in most cases does not" etc can be more powerful.

2. I disagree with the interpretation of the tPA data; in any of the later tPA experiments they were done to test a novel compound in combination with tPA and - not unreasonably - also included untreated controls. This allowed us to extract data for tPA v control, even though this was not the primary purpose of the study.

3. It might be useful to have some discussion of some new approaches by publishers, eg the editorial changes at Nature in May 2013, which are at least a step in the right direction.
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