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Reviewer’s report:

The title, "Good Practice for Conference Abstracts & Presentations" implies that this guidance is for all conference abstracts and presentations. However, this guidance appears mainly directed to commercially supported work. Perhaps the title should be changed to "Good Practice for Commercially Sponsored Conference Abstracts & Presentations".

I am unable to locate the prior document that was posted to PeerJ and it is not referenced.

Throughout - there is a fair amount of redundancy in this report. Even though the authors note there is some overlap, it does not seem necessary. I suggest rewriting to avoid the overlap.

Line 105: This comment seems a bit self-congratulatory: "All comments received, either via PeerJ or by direct email, were positive."

How many representatives of the 65 medical societies and medical conference sites responded? What do they represent?

I don't think this effort, as described, merit these recommendations being positioned as "guidelines."

RE: "Study registration numbers (e.g. ClinicalTrials.gov, EudraCT) should be included on abstracts, posters, and slides." - Does this pertain only to reports of clinical trials?

For the principle and recommendations on funding identification - would be good to see a requirement for explanation of the role of the sponsor/funder in the research and presentation.

The comments about authorship and use of study groups seems inconsistent with best practice. Placing an arbitrary limit on the number of authors and then indicating that a group name can be used ignores the need for accountability for all "authors," including those who are members of a group. This could be addressed in more detail.

Section 1.1.3 This is concerning. Sounds as if this group believes it is acceptable to have an abstract prepared by nonauthors and to do so before a final full manuscript is ready, which presumably, would also include an abstract. Would need to be careful about version control and inconsistencies in versions.
Section 1.1.4 is also concerning. A translator likely may not qualify for authorship. Why not just acknowledge the contribution of the translator? Why would authors "choose not to be listed for such a conference abstract and presentation?"

Section 1.1.5 - what about naming a "corresponding author" or "primary presenter?" What about requests for co-first or co-last authorship?

Section 1.2 - This document does not address how to manage study group members who are "authors" vs "non-author collaborators" who are also members of the group.

Throughout - there are references to "if space permits." If there is important information that cannot fit on an abstract/poster - could a link to website with this information be provided?

There is no guidance on best practices for Titles, Tables, Graphs.

Section 3.2.2 This statement "Posters are not peer-reviewed by conferences" does not appear to be accurate. Many conference peer review abstracts submitted for poster presentation.

Section 3.2.3 - "The lead author" - who is this? First, Last/Senior?
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