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Author's response to reviews:

Dear editor,

Please find below the changes made to the final version of the paper.

Reviewer 1:

1. Consider changing the title of figure 1.

Reply: Since this figure is adopted from another paper it is not possible to change the title in the figure.

2. Refer to the anniversary of the next decade, instead of next (year’s) anniversary in the conclusion.

Reply: The sentence now reads: In doing so we are confident that by the 30th Cochrane anniversary we will be better able to meet the exciting challenges and opportunities presented by mixed methods systematic reviews and reviews of complex interventions.

Reviewer 2:

1. Change the term ‘overly’ into ‘highly’.

Reply: The sentence now reads: However, Cochrane’s highly prescriptive form of standardization, which specifies only one way to conduct a QES, may be perceived as counterproductive by a substantial proportion of members of the qualitative research community.

Editor: Comply with the editorial rules laid out for the manuscripts.

Reply: We have added key-words to the paper and we changed the footnotes into endnotes.

We hope you will find these changes satisfying.
Yours sincerely,

On behalf of the authors,

Karin Hannes