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Author's response to reviews: see over
We would like to thank the editor and the reviewers for their in-depth review and supportive comments for our revised manuscript (Manuscript ID MS:1048382105139558). In the following, we provide a point-by-point response to each comment.

Editorial Revisions

1. Please format your abstract according to the guidelines for authors [http://www.biomedcentral.com/authors/authorfaq/format](http://www.biomedcentral.com/authors/authorfaq/format). "Results and Discussion" section needs to be re-named as “Results”.

[RESPONSE] In the revised manuscript we re-named “Results and Discussion” as “Results”.

2. Name of ethics committee needs to be included. Please update your ethics statement to include the name of the ethics committee that approved your study.

[RESPONSE] In the revised manuscript we clarified the ethics committee in the Method section: “Approval of ethics for this study was given by the CCHMC institutional review board (study ID: 2010-3031) and a waiver of consent was authorized.” (p.5 line 96-98).

Reviewer One

1. Given the comprehensive and well executed revisions in response to the prior critique, there are no major/minor/discretionary revisions needed at this time.

[RESPONSE] We appreciate the reviewer’s thoughtful review and constructive comments for our manuscript.

Reviewer Two

1. This manuscript is much improved and reads very well. It will be a valuable contribution to the journal.

Authors have diligently addressed all my previous concerns.

[RESPONSE] We appreciate the reviewer’s positive comment.

2. Minor change:
p. 11, line 212: "In practice some patients (e.g. patients who did not have historical enrollments) could be ineligible or every clinical trials..." (change 'every' to 'all' or make 'clinical trials' singular.

[RESPONSE] Thank you for pointing out the typo. We rephrased the sentence as “In practice some patients (e.g. patients who did not have historical enrollments) could be ineligible for all clinical trials…” (p.11 line 211-212)

3. line 214 - add word 'the' before "...full-population case.."

[RESPONSE] We modified the sentence accordingly in the revised manuscript (p.11 line 214).

4. p.17 - Kind of an abrupt ending. I would consider merging the 2 sentences on lines 326-328 by changing the phrase 'On the other hand' to 'however' .... That would make your final statement/conclusion feel more as a contribution to the literature/methods base than a limitation...

[RESPONSE] We appreciate the reviewer’s suggestion. We changed the phrase ‘on the other hand’ to ‘however’ in the revised manuscript (p.17 line 327).