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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We appreciate your and reviewer remarks about our manuscript. Your suggestions helped us to improve the scientific quality of our paper.

Below we present a point-to-point answer for each comment. The changes in manuscript text are highlighted in yellow. We would like to highlight that all changes requested were made.

We hope that the current revised version of our manuscript is now suitable to be published in this respectable journal.

We look forward hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

The authors.

Reviewer comment: This is a clearly written protocol manuscript. I have only a few recommendations.

Answer: We appreciate the comments from reviewer about quality of our manuscript. Thank you very much.

Minor essential revisions:
Reviewer comment: 1. Introduction, paragraphs 2 and 3: it is not clear how these
paragraphs fit into the flow of the introduction and set-up of the study. They are well written and obviously related to the general topic, but they may be better placed in the methods section or otherwise tied in better within the introduction.

Answer: We totally agree with reviewer and we decided to exclude these two paragraphs from our introduction.

Reviewer comment: 2. Provide a brief description of identification and recruitment of participants - e.g., how will they be invited, and what screening procedures will be used to identify inclusion / exclusion criteria?

Answer: We provided this description as requested by reviewer at beginning of methods section.

Reviewer comment: 3. Composition of groups...section: there seems to be a misplaced "with a." at the end of the 2nd sentence, or something is missing from the sentence.

Answer: We would like to thank reviewer about this comment regarding this. The "with a." was misplaced and it was excluded from manuscript in current version.

Reviewer comment: 4. The data analysis section should be placed earlier, before the Discussion section.

Answer: We moved data analysis to before discussion section as requested by reviewer.

Reviewer comment: Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Answer: We appreciate the comment from reviewer about importance of our manuscript. Thank you very much.

Reviewer comment: Quality of written English: Acceptable

Answer: We appreciate the comment from reviewer about quality of English language of our manuscript.

Reviewer comment: Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Answer: We appreciate the comment from reviewer about statistical analysis employed in our manuscript.