Author's response to reviews

Title: Industry-supported meta-analyses compared with meta-analyses with non-profit or no support: Differences in methodological quality and conclusions

Authors:

Anders W Jørgensen (awj@cochrane.dk)
Katja L Maric (k.mrc@hotmail.com)
Britta Tendal (bt@cochrane.dk)
Annesofie Faurschou (af16@bbh.regionh.dk)
Peter C Gøtzsche (pcg@cochrane.dk)

Version: 4 Date: 28 August 2008

Author's response to reviews: see over
28 August 2008

Our comments on reviewers' reports

**Referee: 1**
**Reviewer:** Tom A Trikalinos

**Tom A Trikalinos comment:** As per my previous response, this is a nicely written paper. I had no major comments in the previous round. The authors have addressed all my comments/suggestions. Thanks for the opportunity to review this work.

**Our comment:** No comments

**Referee: 2**
**Reviewer:** Joel Lexchin

**Minor Essential Revisions:**
**Joel Lexchins comment:** The authors should state the purpose of their study at the end of the Background section of the Abstract

**Our comment:** In the Background section of the abstract we have now included: “We compared all industry-supported meta-analyses of drug-drug comparisons with those without industry support.”

**Discretionary Revisions:**
**Joel Lexchins comment:**
Page 8, third paragraph:
Something has been left out of the first sentence of this paragraph.

**Our comment:** The typo “Of trials have found similar results.” has been corrected to “Studies of trials have found similar results.”

**Joel Lexchins comment:**
Page 9, second paragraph:
I'm not sure that the fact that Andy Oxman developed both the scale for judging the methodologic quality of meta-analyses and the Cochrane Handbook is necessarily a limitation.

**Our comment:** We agree, however some people may think that this can have an impact on the judgement of the quality score of Cochrane reviews.