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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Dr. Edmunds,

We send revised manuscript and replies to the reviewer. We have studied the referee's comments carefully and have made corrections which we hope are acceptable.

Yours sincerely,

Koh-ichi Sakata, M.D
Department of Radiology,
Sapporo Medical University,
School of Medicine,
S1W16, Chuo-Ku, Sapporo, 060-8543
Japan
Fax.+81-11-613-9920
E-mail: sakatak@sapmed.ac.jp
TELEPHONE: +81-11-611-2111 (EXT. 3535)
[Responses to Referee 2’s comment]

“So, the authors have reviewed the statistical analyses and have presented the correct results. All is well. However, personally I would be unhappy about this sort of analysis because they have only looked at their data in a univariate manner - biologically this is unsound. Systems are multifactoral, and as such should be analysed in an appropriate fashion. The manuscript is too far down the line though for such a drastic re-analysis...... So my suggestion would be that the authors should add a sentence in their conclusions along the lines that 'Our results are based on univariate comparisons, and as such, should be viewed with some caution.'

We added the following sentences on page 3, the last para. .

“However, our results are based on univariate comparisons, and as such, should be viewed with some caution.”

We also the following sentences on page 17, the last para. .

“However, our results are based on univariate comparisons, and as such, should be viewed with some caution.”