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Response to reviewers’ comments

**Review 1 (Elisabeth Paice)**

#5 We did not measure the rate of agreement between ANRs and ECRs for individual papers, so we cannot add this.

#6 We hope the policy implications of our findings are clear from the first and last paragraphs of the discussion -- i.e. that it may be dangerous for editors to ‘count votes’ and that reviewers might improve with additional information or training on certain aspects of reviewing. We have also added a sentence on p. 8 spelling out the implications.

**Review 2 (David Moher)**

p4 We have added the word ‘peer’

p4 We have defined ‘tone’ and also clarified this on p6 in the 1st Methods paragraph

p5 We have included the dates for the submissions.

p5 We have added a sentence on how the overall score was calculated

p6 We consider that p-values are adequate for this relatively straightforward study. We agree that 95% confidence intervals are useful when expressing clinical measurements, since they indicate the magnitude of an effect size, but we did not feel they were necessary when comparing scores from a rating scale

p7 We have added a paragraph on p9 discussing the study’s limitations

p9 We feel we have presented the results of pertinent studies and it is beyond the scope of the study (and our statistical expertise!) to pool these results.