

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 11295

Title: Results availability from clinical research in the Russian Federation: the role of legal and ethical regulations.

Reviewer code: 02453015

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-05-14 22:37

Date reviewed: 2014-05-15 03:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very valuable study about the trend of publication of clinical research. The conclusion is supported by solid data analysis. Minor concerns: 1. Abstract is missing. 2. It should be described how many authors did the search, abstracted data, as well as how to solve disagreement when it occurs. 3. A funnel plot is highly recommended to show publication bias.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

ESPS manuscript NO: 11295

Title: Results availability from clinical research in the Russian Federation: the role of legal and ethical regulations.

Reviewer code: 00910998

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-05-14 22:37

Date reviewed: 2014-06-24 15:50

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very interesting survey regarding the status of clinical research in Russian Federation and emphasizes that a transparent process to make available the results of all studies is still missing. The only point not touched by authors regards the informed consent. Is it necessary to obtain it before any study related activities? At page 5 design is misspelled deign. The statement "Meta-analyses can provide valid actionable conclusions when the results from all conducted studies are available for independent analyses. " in the core tip and abstract is in my opinion misleading and should be eliminated