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Dear Editor,

We would like to thank the reviewers for their helpful and insightful comments. We have revised the paper in line with the comments and have responded as outlined below.

We thank for the opportunity to revise the paper.

Yours sincerely

Andreas Lundh, Lasse T. Krogsgbøll and Peter C. Gøtzsche

Reviewer #1

Q1. There is only one minor point that needs to be fixed. In the Abstract the authors say that in 4 of the 12 seemingly independent trials the sponsors had a role in writing the report whereas in the text the authors say that it is 8 of the 12 trials.

*In the abstract we wrote:*

“In 4 of the 12 seemingly independent trials, the protocol described sponsors’ involvement in writing the report while the published paper explicitly stated that the sponsor was not involved.“

*In the results we wrote:*

“In 8 of the additional 12 trials that appeared to have been conducted independently of the sponsor, the sponsor nevertheless appeared to have written the protocol, could stop the trial early, had issued confidentiality clauses or had influence on writing of the manuscript (Table 3). This is not the same as the abstract only deals with writing the report and the results with other issues (e.g. confidentiality clauses or could stop trial early). The reason for the differences is that we wanted a shorter sentence in the abstract and therefore focused on reporting.

Q2. There are also a few spots where the wording is awkward or where the tense of the verbs is incorrect.

*As suggested by the peer reviewer and editor we have improved the language. Please see the manuscript.*
Q1. Abstract, page 2, section Methods: The last three words of the paragraph ".....and describe them" can be omitted.

_We have deleted it._

Q2. Methods, page 5, end of 3d paragraph: it should be written "...and described discrepancies" instead of "...and describe discrepancies"

_We have changed “describe” to “described”._