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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed the previously raised issues. There are, however, still some inconsistencies, which should be remedied by the authors:

1.) Table 1 shows only one statistical test and probably timepoint (this is not clear), whereas figures show results after each respective cycle. Furthermore means and SD from Table 1 do not match any of the results shown in Figure 1. This discrepancy should be clarified and possibly (descriptive) results from each cycle added to Table 1 with according statistical tests.

2.) There are still some minor errors in the English language such as "indipendent" instead of "independent".

3.) A scheme detailing the timeline of events T0 to T3 in illustration should be added to clarify experimental design.

4.) Sample size(s) should be added to Table 1.

5.) Figures 1 and 2: statistically significant differences should be noted as asterisms indicating the degree of significance (* p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001). Furthermore, standard deviations should be added to all bars and a statement added to the legend that means and standard deviations are shown in the figures. Also, the sample size the means (each bar) are based on should be specifically stated in the Figure legend. As stated above the information given in Table 1 differs from the bars shown in the Figures, which should be clarified. Even if the charts are just for visualisation for the readers, the aforementioned information in the graph would allow a much easier understanding of the results.
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