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Response to Reviewers

Reviewer: J.A. Le Good, Senior Scientific Editor, BMC-series Journals, BioMed Central Ltd
(sent by email to the corresponding author on Sept 13, 2010)

1) We do still require that you now professionally copyedit your manuscript and recommend that you seek guidance from the copyeditor on how to shorten your manuscript to make it more concise and focused. While we do not have space limits you should still try to make the reporting as concise as possible in the interest of readers.

Response: we have done as suggested by the editor. We required the help of Bioscience Editing Solutions (www.bioscienceeditingsolutions.com). The final version of our manuscript was copyedited after making all changes required by the editor. For easy understanding we have incorporated two versions of the manuscript in the Biomedcentral web:
- a final one (revised and copyedited; containing in red colors the work done by Bioscience Editing Solutions).
- a previous version (revised version prior to copyediting; containing in red colors the changes introduced by the corresponding author to improve the manuscript, making it more clear, shorter and more concise)

2) We request that you remove the Figures already included in Reference 26, as these Figures have been already published. We recommend that in this case, you cite the published literature and discuss in your text any relevant previous results.

Response: the figures have been removed (figures 3A, 3B, 3C, and 3D of the previous version). Now, we have uploaded a new Fig 3 (from fig 3A to fig 3H), split into two (they have the name “new figure” to distinguish them from prior figures). Also the figure legend to Fig 3 has been corrected, once the four figures of the old Fig 3 were removed.
We have cited the published literature, as suggested by the editor (reference number 26).

3) As previously recommended by all reviewers (and possibly with advice from your Copyeditor), please tighten your aims and conclusions. Please pay particular attention to your aims as we do not see that sufficient changes have been made compared with your previous submission to us.

Response: as it can be seen in the revised version prior to copyediting, we have now tightened our aims and conclusions. Also we have worked in the Results and Discussion sections, to reduce paragraphs and to conceptually limit the number of entries. We have deleted sentences of the Results in which we discussed too much, in order not to repeat sentences or ideas into the Discussion section. After all this, a reduction of almost 20 % in those two sections was achieved.
Also, after changes, the References section contains 47 references instead of 50.