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Reviewer’s report:

I would like to congratulate the authors for their challenging initiative and thorough work. Research waste is a huge problem in the medical area (1), negatively affecting the population research is supposed to be helping. The responsibility for avoiding research waste rests primarily with the investigators, but it is not restricted to them. Ultimately, the responsibility for avoiding research waste must be shared with all parts involved in the process of making and using that research. When the peer review process fails to identify errors, such as the ones highlighted in this article, readers must be aware that they are also part of this chain and confident that they can do something about it. This paper is a good example of how to react when something odd is identified in a scientific publication; it is a call to duty for authors, peer reviewers and journal editors; and also a reminder to research institutions, funders, research regulators, policy makers and clinicians that bad science shall not pass.
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