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Reviewer’s report:

This paper reads well and I would recommend it to be published.

My only issue with the paper is there is no comment of the partial non independence of the 2 main groups surveyed - a fair few of the CI's of the HTA trials questioned may well have been from the UKCRC CTUs also surveyed - so there has to be overlap in the data and this has not been at least commented on. If a breakdown could be added that would be good, however if not I think this issue should at least be acknowledged in the paper.

There are couple of changes/comments that I would suggest:

Line 103 - should this be Word and not word

Line 144 - here you state 67% - in the abstract you have rounded down to 66%

There is inconsistency in your description of UK CTUs throughout the paper including in the acknowledgement - should this not always be UKCRC registered CTUs?
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