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Responses to round 2:

The text has been amended as suggested in Points 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10

We don't agree with point 3 and have not changed the order as suggested

Point 2: We agree that meta-regression is a useful technique for the purposes suggested. However, we haven't used it in this paper. We therefore don't believe that it is helpful to describe it here.

Point 8: We agree with the referee that there is not a materially significant difference between the point estimates in the 1994 and 2000 versions. However, the confidence intervals in 1994 only just crossed, suggesting a possible difference of 'borderline significance'. This was how it was interpreted at the time (incorrectly). Our point was the danger of over-interpreting borderline or spurious findings and we have amended the discussion section to make this clearer.