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The Editor,

BMC Medical Research Methodology,

Dear Sir/Madam

**MS: 1301903416495877: The assessment of the quality of reporting of meta-analyses in diagnostic research: a systematic review.**

We would like to thank the reviewer for his comments. We have tried to incorporate his suggestions into the manuscript. We hope this will improve the readability and quality of the resubmitted manuscript.

Yours faithfully,

Brian H Willis
(Corresponding author)

Muireann Quigley
Response to reviewer, Rob J Scholten

1. We understand the reviewer’s comments on the use of the term of ‘meta-analysis’ and we have tried to limit its use in this manuscript. However, to maintain continuity with a sister publication [reference 16], which analyses the same set of studies, we have maintained the use of meta-analysis as defined in this manuscript and the earlier publication.

2. We have incorporated the observation made by the reviewer that using a ‘biased’ selection of studies actually strengthens the conclusion in the limitations section of the discussion (para 2 p17 and para 1 p18).

3. We have included a paragraph in the results section that describes the effects of having some of the eligibility criteria coinciding with some of the items of PRISMA (para 2 p11).

4. Following on from point 3 we have provided an explanation in the results on why some of the items of PRISMA may have a RR close to 1 with a narrow confidence interval (para 2 p14).