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Re: Revision of the manuscript TRLS-D-18-00102R1, title: Reporting quality of randomized controlled trial abstracts in the seven high-ranking anesthesiology journals

Dear Dr. Kowark,

hello, we are very grateful for the detailed comments we received from you and anonymous reviewers. We appreciate the time that was taken to assess our manuscript. We did our best to address the comments and revise the manuscript accordingly. Hereby you will find our point-by-point response to the comments. We highlighted changes in the manuscript using the ‘track changes’ feature in Word.

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1: Thank you for your careful attention to the previous set of comments - in general they have been satisfactorily resolved. I have a few minor comments on the changes made in this revision:
1. - Abstract - the figure of 16% appears twice in the Results section in relation to correspondence; perhaps this is duplication that might be avoided?

Response: This was revised as suggested.

2. - Background line 2 - would read better as 'paywalls' not 'paywall'

Response: This was revised as suggested.

3. - Near end of background, suggest add the word 'the' to give: "Furthermore, we wanted to explore the current state of affairs in more recent years, as CONSORT-A was published ten years ago [1]."

Response: This was revised as suggested.

4. - Methods outcomes - typo in last line - "across"

Response: This was revised as suggested.

5. - Discussion: second paragraph - "This modest increase in average adherence of 2.7% indicates that the 2008-2009..." - as the percentages this difference refers to have been rounded to whole numbers, should this be too? (although it would actually be 2%).

Response: This was revised as suggested, to read 2%.

6. - Minor: sometimes the journal is spelled 'Anesthesia', sometimes 'Anaesthesia' - the latter is correct.

Response: This was revised as suggested.

7. - Discussion: apologies if missed in first draft, but the word 'the' should be included in: "Furthermore, in our analysis we included the second..."

Response: This was revised as suggested.
8. - Discussion: "...because they are not willing/able to pay for it..." - suggest avoid using slash in this context, where 'or' will do

Response: This was revised as suggested. We deleted a slash and wrote ‘or’ instead.

9. - Discussion: minor, but "...via old-fashioned snail mail" seems too informal to me - like slang. Suggest '...via post'

Response: This was revised as suggested.

10. - Discussion: sentence starting "Limitations of this study..." is now very long, consider splitting up.

Response: We revised the ‘Limitations’ paragraph as follows: we split it into two smaller paragraphs, as suggested.

11. - Discussion, end of same sentence, typo "defficiencies" - should be "deficiencies".

Response: This was revised as suggested.

12. - Discussion, same paragraph: "For this reason, we resorted to using PubMed..." - minor comment, but 'resorted to' sounds like a negative decision after everything else has been exhausted and so on - I assume it was a positive choice as the best available methodology to you, so you could consider re-wording.

Response: We revised this fragment in the following way: we deleted “we resorted to using PubMed” and instead wrote “we used PubMed”.

Additional changes

Due to many valuable suggestions that we received from editors and anonymous reviewers, we acknowledged their contribution in the Acknowledgements section, as follows:

We are very grateful to editors and anonymous peer-reviewers for valuable comments that have contributed to better final version of the manuscript.
We hope that the revised manuscript and responses will be satisfactory.

Sincerely,

Livia Puljak and Katja Janackovic