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Review trial

Reporting of critical care trial abstracts: a comparison before and after the announcement of CONSORT guideline for abstracts

Thank you for this manuscript. The subject is highly interesting when we consider the large number of RCT published every week in international journals. Indeed, abstract's structure must be perfect to allow the clinician/scientist to appreciate manuscript's results at first sight.

Abstract: Can you mention clearly the primary outcome of your study?

The sentence Page 7: "while a significant decline was seen between periods (p<0,01), intervention …….. " may be reformulated to improve clarity.

Could you add other reflexion/hypothesis in the discussion section on the "WHY" consort guideline are not fully respected by authors and editors/reviewers?

Can you argue not to have compared the evolution of these abstract's quality markers of publication to very high impact factor journals' such as JAMA and NEMJ or journal endorsing CONSORT guideline over the same period? David Moher (JAMA) did not focused specifically on abstract's quality.

It is difficult to draw conclusion on these results in 2016 (nearly 2017) considering the after period in 2011-2012. Have you any data on secular trends?

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

Acceptable
Quality of figures
All images and figures within the manuscript should be genuine i.e. without evidence of manipulation. No specific feature within an image may be enhanced, obscured, moved, removed, or introduced. If you have concerns about the veracity of the figures you should choose the first option below.

Statistical review
Is it essential that this manuscript is seen by an expert statistician? If so, please give your reasons in your report.
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