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Reviewer’s report:

This is a very relevant and timely guideline that is needed to further increase the transparency and usefulness of clinical trials data.

The overview is concise and the supplementary guideline document very detailed and informative. I have a few suggestions to increase the clarity of the manuscript (comments are in order of appearance in the text and not in order of importance):

1. page 3 (Background, line 16): The authors state that the summary result should be "fully reported and published in medical journals" - this statement could be understood that publishing in journals is the only way of making the results transparent - the importance of results registration should be also clearly emphasized.

2. Methods section is not comprehensive and there is not enough reference to already published work (ref. 23?). This section just lists the steps in the guideline generation, but this is not enough detail to justify the rigor of the methodological approach. There is a general reference to the full supplementary document, but this is not enough to clarify the validity of the individual steps. The authors may think about a graphical presentation of the individual steps in the generation of the guideline.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

Yes
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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