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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Sir
We have studied the request for changes of the format of our manuscript. Below we comment each of the requested changes. We do hope the manuscript now have a desired format.

Author list: Your comment made us aware that we had switched the second and third author in the submission process. This is now corrected. However, we do wonder why one of us have a comment of “not registered” attached to her name, and do hope that this is of no practical importance.

References 12 and 13 – non-functioning link to website: These two links have for some unknown reason ceased to function since our submission. However, we do not have to include the links in these two references, and we have thus omitted the links (but kept the references).

References 91-96: These references only occur in Table 2 [Additional file 2]. In all the three Tables that are provided as additional files (Tables 1, 2 and 3) we have several references, but only in Table 2 do we have references that not occur other places in the manuscript. We have chosen to give these six references numbers after the 90 references of the manuscript proper. We do hope that is the correct way to solve this.

Tables as additional files: Table 4 we suggest included in the final formatted manuscript. We have included this Table in the Tables section at the end of the manuscript and we have put the legend below the Table (instead of above as in the previous version). We suggest that Tables 1-3 are provided as additional files, due to their size (and also due to the fact that two of them have a landscape orientation). In the manuscript we have added references to the additional files when these three Tables are mentioned.

Last week we discovered a minor error in the manuscript that we mentioned in an e-mail to the editor. This error is now corrected in the revised manuscript. We have also done a minor change in the Results section (omitting the last sentence in the paragraph presentation of the paper of Hales and co-workers on page 14). No other changes have been made.