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Revised draft submitted by authors

ME checks whether comments have been addressed appropriately and highlights any queries for the Co-Ed

Not ready for sign-off

ME sends comments to authors

Co-Ed considers the review for sign-off

MECIR screening, final copyedit and publication

Who is checking what and when?

Circulated to Co-ordinating Editors and Content Editors for approval or suggests for amendment.

Search made for cross-over with other reviews in progress or published on CLib.

Title registered on Cochrane Collaboration database ‘Archie’. New authors provided with information on Cochrane protocol development training and use of in house Cochrane software (RevMan) and use of ‘Archie’. TSC provides assistance in drafting search strategies and Contact Editor assigned.

ME, TSC and Contact Editor undertake full internal assessment

Authors emailed with an update and state intention to provide comments.

ME checks for the logical application of the Handbook, so each section of the protocol meets content requested in the Handbook. The ME is not responsible for deciding whether decisions taken on methods/stats are appropriate, just that decisions have been made

TSC checks search section and search strategies adequate.

Contact Editor checks that the clinical content is appropriate for the review question and elements of the methods relevant to content, e.g. choice of outcomes. Completes summary as necessary.

If the ME is unhappy with how comments have been addressed the TSC/Contact Editor/Co-Ed will be consulted (as appropriate) and the protocol will be returned to authors again etc.

Methodological Editor checks that protocol has been drafted conducted according to the Cochrane Handbook guidance and that methods chosen have been implemented appropriately.

Statistical Editor checks that the protocol predetermines methods for statistical elements to be used in of the full review.

Content peer reviewers are responsible for checking the clinical content of the review, this includes the background section, elements of the methods relevant to content, e.g. choice of outcomes.

Consumer peer reviewers are involved to obtain feedback on the way the review is written with regard to its accessibility.