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We appreciate the last comments offered by the Reviewers and the opportunity to revise our manuscript in accordance with his suggestions. Below is the Authors’ response to the Reviewers’ comments and information about manuscript revisions following these comments. For your convenience your comment is reproduced in italics and is followed by our response.

Reviewer 1 – Comments for the Authors

The authors have partially responded to the comments I raised in the previous round.

However, it is an unavoidable fact that statistically significant findings in the context of low power are very likely to be false.

The following article describes this apparently paradoxical conclusion (many people think low power results in a risk of false negatives) very nicely:

Sifting the evidence—what's wrong with significance tests?
Sterne JA, Davey Smith G.

The authors may wish to make more of this point, although they do acknowledge these limitations somewhat in the current discussion.

The framing of their data as hypothesis-generating, rather than confirmatory, is certainly helpful in this respect.
AUTHORS' RESPONSE: As suggested by the Reviewer, in the revised manuscript we have presented our data as hypothesis-generating rather than confirmatory considering not sufficient statistical power of the study. Thus, we have reported our results throughout the manuscript without arbitrary division of them into “significant” or “non-significant”. In addition, we have explained such approach in the Discussion section and referred to the recommended by the Reviewer article of Sterne JAC and Smith GD: Sifting the evidence-what's wrong with significance tests? BMJ 2001, 322:226-231.