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Reviewer's report:

Comments to authors:
For the most part the replies to comments made by the reviewers have been handled well. It would have been better to have specific responses to each of the comments rather than a collective response to groups of them that meant the reviewer had to check each of them in the revised manuscript.

Responses to reviewers.
Melzer 3, table footnote. The authors state as part of the footnote: “Note: A large Mp compared to the Mr indicates the ANOVA model fits well.” While this can be true, it is not true in general. One may have large coefficient of determination and still have a model lack of fit. See lack of fit testing in Draper NR & Smith H Jr: Applied Regression Analysis, 3rd Edition. J Wiley & Sons Inc. Since the authors have not used this phrase in the manuscript, this is not a problem for them to fix.

Goldsmith 29. In the revised Figure 1, this reviewer still does not see the scar. Maybe a more seasoned clinician can see it, however, from the copy I had, it is still not visible.

Revised graphs.
The graphs are much better now that the axes are the same length when they are likely to be compared. However, the fact the all the y axis labels are listed vertically along with the numerical labels, will still be a problem for some readers, and the authors should consider making each of these horizontally.

Revised paper.
1. P(age) 6, p (aragraph) 2, l(ine) 10. Drop [in order] in front of [to].
3. P 9, p 4, l 2 and 4. Replace [ranging] by [varying] like has already been done in the rest of the paper.
4. P 11, p 2, l 4. Suggest replacing [significant] by [clinically important].
5. P 18, l 2. The scar is still not obvious to this reviewer.