**Revisor Revisor B** **Commentary 1 (Abstract – methods section):**“Authors were categorized on concordance between self-reported disclosures and payments listed in the database” - By reading the main text, I understand an author is considered multiple times if written multiple papers. Please clarify the sentence, as it suggests data are grouped by author, and not by paper or author-paper pair.

**Reply 1:** Following this commentary I have introduced changes to the abstract’s methods section in order to clarify that authors who authored multiple articles were counted as new authors, since each new article submission offered a new opportunity for financial disclosure.

**Revisor B** **Commentary 2:**   “Portuguese Journal of Cardiology” is in italic; “Revista Portuguesa de Cardiologia” is not. Please standardize it.

**Reply 2:** Following this commentary I have standardized all references to this publication in italic style.

**Revisor B** **Commentary 3**: According to the new portuguese orthographic agreement, months of  
the year no longer have an uppercase.

**Reply 3:** Following this commentary I have modified all months written in Portuguese to lowercase.   
  
**Revisor B** **Commentary 4**: “24 articles (96%) had at least one author with undisclosed payments” - This information should not be mentioned in the abstract if it is not presented in the results section.

**Reply 4:** Following this commentary I have introduced this information in the results section.   
  
**Revisor B** **Commentary 5**: **“**KEYWORDS: please match the exact Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms ([http://www.nlm.nih](http://www.nlm.nih/). gov/mesh/MBrowser.html) – “Publications” is the MeSH term. Also, this section contains a typo – “conflicto de interesses”.”  
  
**Reply 5:** Following this commentary I have replaced the previous keywords with the exact MeSH terms ,as follows:

”Keywords: Publications, Ethics, Portugal, Conflict of Interest, Bioethics.

Palavras-chave : Publicações, Ética, Portugal, Conflito de Interesse, Bioética.”

**Revisor B** **Commentary 6 (Introduction):** “The ICMJE form requires authors to disclose their associations with commercial entities that provided support for the work submitted; associations with commercial entities that could be viewed as having an interest in the general area of the submitted manuscript; information about relevant financial relationships outside the submitted work; as well as nonfinancial associations that may be relevant to the submitted manuscript.2” - The author pratically uses the original sentence, except that the original source states “any similar financial associations involving their spouse or their children under 18 years of age”. The mentioned COI form was later updated and this segment was removed. I suggest the author cites also the updated version of the ICMJE form, so as the sentence agrees with its sources.

**Reply 6:** Following this commentary I have included a citation which will redirect the reader to the updated version of the ICMJE form. The text now reads as follows: ”The ICMJE form requires authors to disclose their associations with commercial entities that provided support for the work submitted; associations with commercial entities that could be viewed as having an interest in the general area of the submitted manuscript; information about relevant financial relationships outside the submitted work; financial relationships involving children (under 18 years of age) or spouse/partner ;as well as nonfinancial associations that may be relevant to the submitted manuscript.2 The ICMJE disclosure form has since been updated and no longer requires information pertaining to children or spouse/partner to be included. 3”

**Revisor B** **Commentary 7 (Introduction):**    “Disclosing CO is useful because it helps the reader understand what are the relationships between the authors and various commercial entities that have special interests in the reported information.” – This full uncited sentence was appropriated from Drazen 2009 (“Uniform format for disclosure of competing interests in ICMJE journals”), forwhat it lacks the respective reference. It also has a typo (“CO” instead of COI).

**Reply 7:** Following this commentary I have included a citation and corrected the typo. The text now reads as follows: “Disclosing COI is useful because it helps the reader understand what are the relationships between the authors and various commercial entities that have special interests in the reported information.2”

**Revisor B** **Commentary 8 (Introduction):**  “ I suggest the presentation of the transparency platform’ URL (optional).“

**Reply 8:** Following this commentary I have included a URL to the transparency platform.   
  
**Revisor B** **Commentary 9 (Discussion): ”**The restriction to one field-specific magazine may have introduced selection bias, as inevitably doctor-industry relationships greatly vary, being influenced by many factors. This risk of bias should at least be acknowledged.”

**Reply 9**: Following this commentary I have included an acknowledgment of this particular limitation.

**Revisor B** **Commentary 10 (Discussion):”** “The ICMJE requires that payments related to board membership, consultancy, employment, expert testimony, gifts, grants, pending grants, payment for manuscript preparation, patents (planned, pending or issued), royalties, payment for development of educational presentations including service on speakers’ bureaus, stock, stock options, travel or accommodation expenses covered or reimbursed, or others, made by any entity that could be considered broadly relevant to the published work to be reported.5” - The cited source mentions the form was updated, but does not present these data. Please cite the ICMJE updated COI form.”

**Reply 10:** Following this commentary I have included a citation which will redirect the reader to the updated version of the ICMJE form.  
  
**Revisor B** **Commentary 11 (Discussion):** “After reviewing payments listed in the transparency database, it was noticed that in one of the three studies that acknowledge to have received funding for the development of the submitted work, one of the authors had previously received multiple payments related to consultancy honoraria from the same pharmaceutical company that funded the submitted work in question. Whether one agrees with comprehensiveness of the ICMJE requirements or not, in this particular instance, it seems clear that an author who receives multiple payments from a particular pharmaceutical company has something to disclose when authoring a paper funded by that same company. Moreover, this particular paper compares two drugs, and concludes that the drug marketed by the company that funds study achieves better clinical results at a lower cost. The point here, is not judge the reliability of the data of this study nor to raise any suspicion on the integrity of this particular author. Instead, the point is, when over 200.000€ of industry payments go unreported, it is easy to understand how  
even payments that fall under the most consensual conceptions of COI can be omitted.” - I think pointing out this specific author and scenario is somehow confusing, as this was one of the few studies that actually reported funding. Maybe the author could clarify this situation (was it incomplete  
disclosure?), and resume it.

**Reply 11**: Indeed this is one of few studies acknowledging funding, and therefore, one of the very few publications submitted in which editors had the opportunity to establish the presence of a conflict of interest. The reviewer points a possible solution to this situation – (“Maybe the author could clarify this situation (was it incomplete disclosure?), and resume it.”) – which, in my opinion, seems to be a very suitable one. However, the point I intended to make with my analysis is not that such situations lack suitable solutions but rather to establish that our current editorial policies do not prevent them from happening. To me, it would seem to be more desirable to prevent incomplete disclosures than to acknowledge and rectify them after publication. Following this commentary I have rearranged the discussion in order to better illustrate my point.  
  
**Revisor B** **Commentary 12 (Discussion):** At the end of discussion, study limitations are oddly presented – maybe there is a way of presenting them earlier / harmoniously integrated with the rest of the discussion.

**Reply 12:** Following this commentary I have rearranged the discussion in order to better integrate study limitations.  
  
  
**Revisor B** **Commentary 13 (References):** References are not in agreement with the AMP format recommendations  
  
**Reply 13:** Following this commentary I have reviewed references format and I believe they are now in full compliance with the AMP recommendations

------------------------------------------------------  
**Revisor C Commentary 14:** Recomenda-se uma última revisão gramatical e de estilo.

**Reply 14**: Following this commentary I have reviewed the full text and made minor grammar and style modifications.