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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript is greatly improved, and the response to comments thoughtful. In particular, the clarity between the different methodological approaches improves readability, and ultimately the future use of the paper by the field.

I have a few minor issues: with the Microsoft word line numbers in reference to the clean copy

- Line 133/4 Registered CTU responses directed changes 134 to the 59 strategies initially used: Three strategies… Reconsider use of :

- Lines 273-278: Very long sentence which does not make sense consider revising.

- Could you check the use of the possessive " ' " throughout is appropriate e.g. Chief Investigator's views (one CI) or Chief Investigators' views (1+ CI)

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

An article of importance in its field

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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