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Author's response to reviews: see over
Point by Point response

(1) Case study on MMSE and dementia AND Case study on MOOD and depressive disorders
The authors are still implicitly (see paragraph immediately under Table 2) or explicitly (see paragraph under Figure 8) using a standard Wald test to test the study variance. Unless I am mis-understanding something, the regularity conditions leading the use of a N(0,1) null distribution no longer holds, as the variance parameter is on the boundary of its permissible space, i.e. 0 under the null hypothesis. Hence, a more appropriate p-value for testing the study variance parameter would be (standard 2-sided Wald p-value)/2. This would certainly affect the conclusions in the second case study, where the authors claim “We see a borderline significant effect for the random (study) effect.”. The random study effect would now become significant. Can the authors either defend their current position or work in the necessary amendment

This has been addressed in the text at the end of section 3.1.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS
(1) Background, paragraph 5, line 3
“... solid line in Figure 1.)”. There is no solid line in Figure 1. Please amend.

Done.

Only minor issues not for publication
(1) – (29).

All corrected.