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Dear Editors:

I hope you are well. Please find attached our revised manuscript entitled “Design, Analysis, and Presentation of Crossover Trials.” Thank you for the detailed review by Dr. Matthews. We have incorporated all of his comments.

Our responses to each point are marked with a bullet:

1. Page 4, second sentence: ‘..., there is likely a positive’ insert ‘to be’ before ‘a’
   o Thank you. We have made this change.

2. Page 5, first sentence of the second para. of ‘Study Cohort’ now reads as if there is only one sequence in a crossover trial: suggest ‘...receives two or more interventions through randomization to one of a set of prespecified sequences of treatments.’
   o Thank you. We have made this change.

3. Page 7/8. In resolving the mystery of the trials with one period / treatment a further issue arises. If there are 127 trials in total and 6 of these report only one period, how can 122 trials use a paired test for treatment effect (table 2)?
   o Thank you. This was an error on our part and we have now made this change (121/6).

4. Page 11, 2nd para. of Discussion, third sentence: the wording has gone awry here.
   o Thank you. We have revised this to: “We extracted data in duplicate to reduce abstraction errors and resolved discrepancies by consensus.”

5. Page 12, line 10: ‘...whether a trial is continuous...’ insert ‘the main outcome measure in’ (or some such) immediately after ‘whether’
   o Thank you. We have made this change.

6. I mentioned Figure 1 in my first review and you responded. However in my copy it is largely unchanged: the 323 trials excluded in the second large box remain largely unexplained (only 126 exclusions are detailed) (and randomised etc. as opposed to randomized still appears).
   o Thank you. We hope the correct figure is now uploaded. We do not provide details of the 197 non-randomized trials as our overall study inclusion was only for randomized trials. We have made the change to the spelling error.
We again thank the reviewers and editors for their time and efforts in improving this manuscript.

Sincerely

Edward Mills