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Christna Chap, PhD
Executive Editor
BioMed Central
236 Gray's Inn Road
London, WC1X 8HB

Subject: Editor’s Revisions to Manuscript S: 1599611622537098

Dear Dr. Chap:

Thank you very much for the opportunity to revise our manuscript. We changed the manuscript in response to your requests, as detailed below.

*Expand the description and expand your methods section.*

We deleted the sentences “We developed and followed a standard protocol for the systematic review. The technology report describes detailed methods, including the literature search strategies” from the beginning of the methods section. Upon reflection, we felt these passages would lead readers to believe we had reported incomplete or summary methods in the manuscript. However, the methods section as written in the manuscript presents a complete description of how we set about answering the key questions listed on p. 4, lines 13-16.

We would be happy to expand our methods section if you feel we should report information that is not currently contained in the manuscript.

*Include a statement in the manuscript that the study is derived from a technology assessment report and you have permission to reproduce it here (please provide any reference).*

We revised one section of text to more clearly address this point. The revised text reads: “This systematic review is based on a peer-reviewed technology report [13] commissioned by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). A copy of the technology report is available on the AHRQ website (http://www.cms.gov/determinationprocess/downloads/id66aTA.pdf). The technology report served as background material for a Medicare Evidence Development & Coverage Advisory Committee (MEDCAC) Meeting held in November 2009.” (p. 4, lines 3-9)

Under ‘Role of the Funding Source’, we revised a sentence to read as follows: “The McMaster University Evidence-based Practice Centre researched and wrote the initial technology report under contract with the AHRQ, which gave us permission to publish this manuscript.” (p. 6, lines 13-15)
We submitted the AHRQ’s copyright release form along with the original submission of the manuscript.

*Please cite the report in the manuscript.*

The technology report is cited as reference # 13 in the manuscript.

We are submitting two copies of the revised manuscript: a copy with track changes showing our revisions and a clean copy without track changes.

Sincerely,

Parminder Raina, PhD