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COVERING LETTER IN RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS COMMENTS

Thank you reviewers for your comments which I found extremely helpful and interesting.

REVIEWER - SW:

1. I have reduced the word count by over 1,000 words.

2. The structure of the article has been revised to embed the 10Rs+ into the main content instead of leaving it tacked on at the end. It is now a main feature of the paper. Each section contains some examples of a different area of bias that I want to introduce and with a 10R recommendation that aims to address the bias at the end of each section on bias.

3. I have aimed at reducing the number of examples but some areas of bias seem to need slightly more elaboration than others, due to the complexity of the particular bias, so the number varies between sections. Some with more and others with less.

4. There is a summary statement at the beginning introducing the 10Rs.

5. The potential for dispute is encouraged in the article by covering the 10Rs with the Creative Commons Licence Port 3.0 to invite anyone to discuss, debate, share, remix or use in any way they like.

6. The 10Rs table has been simplified but may need elaboration, refinement and consolidation following open debate and feedback. It is intended that the 10Rs is something the public can understand and make use of. For that reason it needs to be readable and so I welcome the comment that it is a very big table and have made it smaller.

REVIEWER - MM:

1. I have tried to soften the statements made in the article but not sure if I have succeeded. Each of the 10Rs+ is open for debate, although I concede that the examples of bias I have given may read like they are set in stone but they are fully referenced. I would appreciate having one or two of the didactic statements identified and an example of how to rewrite them.

2. I have removed the tPA case altogether as there is disagreement between peers about the value of the repeated animal research following the original early work. I do not have access to the papers that explain the justifications given and would welcome the PDFs if they could be supplied to me.

3. I have mentioned the introduction of research checklist in 2013 by the Nature Group and how it is a very good step in the right direction from such a large publishing group which will influence others to do the same.

I look forward to futher comments and advice.

Thank you.

Susan Green