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Reviewer's report:

- Discretionary Revisions

This is a reasonably straightforward, clearly written article. It is possibly a little long and could be edited down a bit.

1. It would be helpful in the introduction to discuss what authorship is and what the implications / responsibilities of authorship are. An explanation of the difference between an author and a writer would be useful.

2. Authorship is one way to acknowledge “significant” contributions made to the piece of work that is being reported in a manuscript. Less significant contributions can be acknowledged in other ways and it would be helpful to discuss these other options (eg what types of contributions should be in the Acknowledgements section)

3. Case study 1 refers to patient recruitment, the clinical investigator and day-to-day management. The credit is given to the investigator but in many cases the work of recruiting and following the participants, ensuring compliance with the protocol, etc is not done by the clinician but by the data manager or research nurse. Is this a contribution that merits authorship?

4. My understanding is that in larger, multi-centre trials (and as an incentive to recruit) that authorship will depend on recruitment of a minimum number (or percentage) of participants. This could be mentioned in the discussion.

Most of the questions I had while reading the paper were dealt with in the discussion.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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