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Author’s response to reviews:
Dear Helen, thank you again for the review of our revised paper. We address the Editor’s comments below, we have made these changes in the revised manuscript and have attached a clean version

1. Please consider the list of authors as it currently stands with reference to our guidelines regarding qualification for authorship (http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship).

Currently, the contributions of authors NS, SN, SO-A and KM do not automatically qualify them for authorship. Please provide clarification on their contributions, or remove their names from the list of authors and place them in the “Acknowledgements” section instead.

An 'author' is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study. We recommend that that you adhere to the guidelines for authorship that are applicable in your research field or, in the absence of any guidelines, to the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) guidelines. According to the ICMJE guidelines, to qualify as an author one should have:
-made substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; and -been involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content; and -given final approval of the version to be published. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content; and -agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Acquisition of funding, collection of data, or general supervision of the research group, alone, does not usually justify authorship.

• Thank you. We have now revised the contributions of the authors to read “GT drafted the report. KE, GT, KMc and SN designed the study. GT, KE, SN and SO-A were responsible for the study conduct. KMc, KE, NS, SN, SO-A participated in the statistical analyses, interpretation and report revisions. All the authors approved the final version and agreed to be accountable for the study”

2. Please include the email addresses of all authors on the title page.

• We have done this on the title page

3. Where they are bigger than a single sheet of A4 please move them to the end of the manuscript.

• Thank you for the suggestion

4. Please provide figure titles/legends under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References. If Figure titles/legends are within the main text of the manuscript, please move them.

• We have done this
5. Please remove the file Response to the Editor.docx from the file inventory as it is no longer required at this stage in the editorial process.

• Thank you. We have done this.

6. Please add a “Conclusions” section after the “Discussion” section. This should state clearly the main conclusions of the research article and give a clear explanation of their importance and relevance.

• Conclusions have been added

7. Please change the heading Introduction to Background

• We have done this.

8. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

• Thank you. Manuscript uploaded