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Reviewer’s report:

You have addressed all points except the point regarding the MCID. I'm not sure you have understood the concept of the MCID and why it is superior to the kruskall-wallis test in this scenario. The MCID is used as a cutoff (rather than used to find a cutoff). The key point is that statistical significance (p-value) is different than clinical significance (MCID).

For example, applying the MCID means that each data point becomes a responder, or non-responder (0 or 1). Once this has been established, the proportions are modelled, classically using logistic regression. Using the MCID allows you to measure the size of the effect, which is more important than a "yes/no" response (p-value).

I urge you to become clear regarding the use of the MCID in these situations, and why it is better than statistical significance to "distinguish the difference" as you say.
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