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Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: Methodological quality of test accuracy studies included in systematic reviews in obstetrics and gynaecology: sources of bias. Morris et al

Again we thank you and the excellent peer reviewer for your kind and careful consideration of the above manuscript. We have addressed the comments as laid out below:

**Associate Editor’s comments:**
1. We have reported the number of articles that included a flow chart within the manuscript.
2. Figure 2 has been converted into a table.
3. The legend has been moved and the terminology improved within figure 1.
4. With regard to the reviewer’s comment “Did the authors find the same poorly reported items compared to other reviews investigating the quality of reporting using STARD?”. We thank you for the explanation and believe that this is a very important comparison to make but is more appropriate to be discussed within the sister paper on STARD. We have thus added a paragraph within the discussion of this paper to address this comment.

We confirm that the manuscript has been read and approved by all the authors and that each author believes that the manuscript represents honest work. The authors guarantee that this manuscript has not been published before and it is not being considered for publication elsewhere. We declare no financial interests, commercial affiliations or conflicts of interest.

We look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

Yours sincerely,

Rachel K Morris