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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for addressing my feedback.

I have a few remaining remarks:

- From the abstract it seems as if only the accepted papers were randomised (control n=340, intervention n=332), and in the Results (line 389) it seems that only the accepted papers underwent web-based outcome assessment. As one of the outcomes is the percentage of accepted papers in the intervention and control group, the randomisation is on accepted and non-accepted papers. Please clarify.

- Line 171: Please mention the block size for the block randomisation

- Line 216: Mention here the reason for the Landis criteria.

- Line 358: Why is adjusted for minimisation? Minimisation is used to make the groups more comparable, so unless the minimisation has failed, there is no need for adjustment

- Line 360: "Compliance was independent of group membership" and line 418 "only one subitem had improved reporting in the intervention group": please consider rephrasing this as "intervention versus control". See, for example, (Line 498-509) "While 3.5% (12/40) of control manuscripts reported sample size calculations compared to 7.6% (25/330) in the intervention group (Cohen's H effect size = 0.18)".
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