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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for letting me see this interesting paper. I found it to be well constructed and well written; the methodology, aims and outcomes were clear. In my view the authors made a persuasive argument for their findings based on their study. I am not competent to assess the statistics; so my only comment may be misplaced BUT I though the completion rate of 45% seemed low to me; and I wondered what difference that might have made. I would have welcomes some comment from the authors on why so few responded and whether the responders were spread equally across all groups.

I was also not completely convinced that the responders did not recognise the influence of sponsorship; is it not possible that they believed that they could account for that potential bias. The complexity of this debate seems to rest on whether it is possible for clinicians to 'handle' bias even if it is not fully conscious; and that there may be compensatory belief systems that are acquired through professional life and practice that mitigate against the industry effect. Worth a comment?

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.
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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.
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