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July 1, 2017

G.J. Melendez-Torres
Editorial Office
Systematic Reviews

Dear Dr. Melendez-Torres

Re: SYSR-D-16-00274R2: A protocol for the systematic review of structural barriers to accessing medical marijuana in the U.S.

Thank you for sending us your comments on our above manuscript. We have addressed your concerns and are pleased to resubmit the manuscript for your kind evaluation. We thank you for insight and your patience with us through the review process.

Best wishes,

Ibitola Asaolu,
For, and on behalf of the authors.

RESPONSE TO EDITOR’S COMMENTS
Comment #1: Your search methods still list Ovid as a database to be searched, though you mentioned in response to reviewers that you addressed this.

Response: Thank you for this observation. Reference to Ovid has now been deleted from the manuscript.

Comment # 2: Your discussion of publication and reporting biases still misses the mark, I think. You mention that publication bias will be avoided by exhaustively searching the literature, but you also note earlier you will exclude grey literature. This section in review protocols is more geared to how you will assess publication bias. You should also discuss separately how you want to address reporting bias in respect of biased reporting WITHIN studies. Instead of discussing 'trials', you probably want to mention studies more generally.

Response: The section on assessment of publication and reporting bias now includes a brief description of how risk of reporting bias will be addressed (see page 7; line 259). In this section, we have noted that the search will include google, google scholar and the grey literature.

Comment # 3: --Your search strategies still do not include truncation or wildcards. (You also state that you have the same strategy for both PubMed and MEDLINE, which doesn't look right as these are different databases). These need to be included in the protocol-registered search string if you are planning on using them.

Response: We have addressed this concern by including separate search strategies for PubMed and MEDLINE. We have also revised the search strategy to include truncation and wild cards as appropriate (see Appendix 2).