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Reviewer’s report:

This is a very important paper providing clear and useful guidelines for sharing individual patient data of publicly funded clinical trials.

The manuscript is very well written. I would suggest only minor modifications.

Abstract: it would be useful to report the funding source in the abstract

Methods: Details of the methods has been published elsewhere and is referenced. However, it would be important for the reader to have a clear summary of how the guidelines were developed. Particularly, what is a 'focussed literature review'? How was it performed? What was the search strategy used? Did the survey involve only researchers from the UK? Although the participants in the workshop is reported in appendix, it would be useful to report a summary of the number and background of these participants.

Discussion: It would also be useful to discuss whether these guidelines are applicable to all trials publicly funded or that the applicability is limited to the UK funded trials. Further, it seems that patients were not involve in this process and it might be useful to discuss that we need some feedback from patients.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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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?
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