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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for revisions to the paper.

I think the revisions are largely appropriate. I have three comments

1. I'd suggest some revisions to the discussion and to the conclusion to reflect the fact that this is a small pilot survey and the results have to be taken as such and not over-generalized.

   eg, the first paragraph of the discussion is too strong.

The authors state:

"These findings suggest that the majority of clinical research studies were published within a year of first submission, which may contradict prior perceptions that the biomedical publication process is too slow"

However, they can only draw conclusions relevant to this study, which they themselves note is a pilot, and this sentence and the related one in the conclusion should be revised accordingly.

I'd suggest they look for other similar text and tone down as needed.

2. The authors state

"Future cross-sectional surveys on this topic may benefit from focusing on specific groups of corresponding authors (e.g., those submitting from US institutions)."

I am not sure why US authors would be a more responsive group. The group that might be more responsive would be a specialty group, especially if an expert from that group is involved.

3. There does not appear to be a specific link to the survey tool in the paper itself, though I note is in the supplementary material.
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