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Author's response to reviews:

Dear David, Lesley and Paul

Please find, as part of this submission to BioMed Central Systematic Reviews, the final revised version, ready for editorial sign-off and copy-editing, of the article entitled:

Methodological developments in searching for studies for systematic reviews: past, present and future?

We have responded to all of the peer reviewers’ comments and supplied a Table outlining how they were dealt with. We have also actioned all the subsequent comments and suggestions made by the Guest Editor, Mike Clarke.

This article is an invited paper under the series celebrating Cochrane’s 20th Anniversary and is from the Cochrane Information Retrieval Methods Group. It addresses progress in information retrieval methods in the context of systematic reviews over the past twenty years since the founding of The Cochrane Collaboration and possible scenarios into future.

We understand that the plan is to try to turn this article around as quickly as possible in time for publication at the Cochrane Colloquium, so please do not hesitate to contact me by e-mail if you have any further queries (carol@lefebvreassociates.org).

With best wishes

Carol (Lefebvre)
on behalf of the co-authors

We should like to thank Ruth Foxlee (TSC, Cochrane Wounds Group and Information Specialist, Cochrane Editorial Unit) and Becky Skidmore (Medical Research Analyst, the Society of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists of Canada) as peer reviewers of this manuscript and Mike Clarke (All Ireland Hub for Trials Methodology Research, Queen’s University Belfast, Northern Ireland) as Guest...
Editor for their helpful comments and suggestions regarding this manuscript. For our responses to the comments and suggestions from the peer reviewers, please refer to Table.