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Reviewer's report:

The utility of the presentation of the data as boxplots with associated p values has been greatly increased. Overall analyses have still not been reported (for example where there are 4 groups in the experiment you would normally report the test for a group difference before looking at individual contrasts of interest). The authors have chosen not to do this but as there are very obvious group difference in all cases it is not a major concern. The implication from the statistical methods is also that data from replicate experiments was simply combined. A variable accounting for experiment should have been included in analysis but again, given the magnitude of the differences this is not as important. However if data from duplicate experiments was simply combined ie an experiment with 3 replicates from 2 experiments was analyses as 6 data points per treatment, with no variable included for experiment) then this needs to be made clear in the methods even though it would not be the preferred way to handle this data. The fact that your within and between experiment errors have been combined is important for other researchers who may wish to use your results to help plan future research

Minor

1. Clarify further how replicate experiments and replicate measures within experiment were handled in the analysis (eg data from replicate experiments as well as replicates within experiments were combined with no allowance for experiment - if this is what was done)
2. Fig 1A is the incorrect figure

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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