Author’s response to reviews

Title: Reporting quality of randomized controlled trial abstracts in the seven high-ranking anesthesiology journals

Authors:
Katja Janackovic (katja.janackovic@gmail.com)
Livia Puljak (livia@mefst.hr)

Version: 3 Date: 29 Sep 2018

Author’s response to reviews:
Ana Kowark, M.D.
Trials

September 29, 2018

Re: Revision of the manuscript TRLS-D-18-00102R2, title: Reporting quality of randomized controlled trial abstracts in the seven high-ranking anesthesiology journals

Dear Dr. Kowark,

hello, thank you for the new comments, and we are pleased that the manuscript is potentially acceptable. Hereby you will find our response to the new comments, and we highlighted changes in the manuscript using the ‘track changes’ feature in Word.

Editor report:

1. As you are using American English in your manuscript, please make sure that you write always "analyzed" instead of "analysed". For example in your table 1 and results part of your abstract.
Response: As suggested, we have checked now the entire manuscript and made sure that we use wording ‘analyzed’. We made one change in the abstract and two in the first table.

2. Results: "There were 25 (4%) of abstracts that did not have..." the end of the sentence should be either: a conclusion statement or conclusion statements

Response: As suggested, we changed into: a conclusion statement.

3. Discussion: first sentence: please add a comma before the word "as"

Response: Comma was added, as suggested.

4. Discussion: Please make two sentences of the very long sentence: " Limitations of this study are the limited number of analyzed journals and limited period in which analyzed trials were published, but we decided to focus ourselves on a specialty field of our interest and our hypothesis was that even current RCTs, published long after introduction of CONSORT-A suffer from reporting deficiencies."

Response: We divided this sentence into two smaller sentences.

5. End of Discussion: Please replace in this sentence the word "will" by "would" "Using such a tool as an intervention should be tested to see whether it will improve quality of reporting in research manuscripts."

Response: We replaced "will" by "would", as suggested.

We hope that the revised manuscript and responses will be satisfactory.

Sincerely,

Livia Puljak and Katja Janackovic