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Author's response to reviews:

Dear editor,

We have accepted most of the suggestions made.

In what follows we outline some of our argumentation for those that were not accepted by the authors:

We would prefer not to name names and dig over old wounds in describing the mixing progress with rejection paragraph. The book for the supplemental guidance produced by the CQIMG was blocked - but we have amended the text so it is a bit more conciliatory in tone. We provide advice to the Cochrane Collaboration as a core function and therefore we think it is OK to say that the Cochrane Collaboration did not accept our contributions, instead of having to name people.

Explanation MIF funding: the MIF funding is not for the Methods Group. It was a research grant awarded to Bangor University to deliver a specific research project involving several entities. We believe it is okay to state that methods groups receive no funding and have stressed the fact that the non-funding issue is a characteristic for all methods groups.

The terminology used to describe Jackie’s role has been taken from her role description. We have added ‘coordinate’ to it.

All other suggestions were dealt with in the way suggested by the editor.

Thanks again for all the helpful advice. Much appreciated.

On behalf of the authors,

Karin Hannes