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Author's response to reviews:

>> Please provide an abstract formatted according to the guidelines for authors <http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/abstracts>. Potential referees will be asked to review the manuscript having seen only the title and abstract, so it is important that these are both informative and concise.

The abstract has been reformatted to follow the guidelines for BMC medical journals. It now contains just 4 sections: background, methods, results, and conclusions.

>> Requesting consent statement. Please state in the Methods section whether written informed consent for participation in the study was obtained from participants or, where participants are children, a parent or guardian.

The sentence on Page 8 regarding IRB approval has been changed to the following: The study obtained ethics approval and a waiver of written informed consent from the Indiana University Institutional Review Board (Study No. 1111007478).

The new sentence reflects that the study did not obtain written consent as it received a waiver of informed consent from the IRB.

Regards,
The Authors