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We thank Sauerbrei and Haeussler for their interest in our paper1 and their methodological comments. Our aim was to undertake these analyses and draw some conclusions from the available literature regarding the prognostic significance of BAG-1 in breast cancer, given multiple studies. We felt that this was important, particularly since BAG-1 is already included in multi-gene assays widely- used as part of routine clinical practice and due to ongoing investigation into the possibility of inhibition of BAG-1 function as a potential therapeutic strategy. We did not use the supplementary information provided within the REMARK Explanation and Elaboration paper2. We provided our interpretation whether details within the REMARK checklist were included in the papers and, as we highlighted, the literature reviewed was heterogeneous and with a range in study quality. We believe our conclusions were drawn with appropriate caveats to highlight this.
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