

Reply to Editor's comment

Editor Initial Decision: Reconsider after minor revisions (Editor review) (19 May 2014) by Stefania Gilardoni

Comments to the Author:

Based on the reviewers' suggestions, the authors improved the manuscript significantly. All the reviewers comments have been considered during the revision.

The only point rose by both the reviewers and still not convincing is related to the box-whisker plot in figure5. I would like to ask if the authors could justify the choice of the Kruskal-Wallis test to evaluate the difference significance. The Kruskal-Wallis test is usually employed for comparing more than 2 sets of data. If the authors applied the Mann-Whitney U test, would they obtain similar results?

We thank Editor and Reviewers for this comment.

We have applied the Mann-Whitney U test as requested. The results are very similar to those obtained with the Kruskal-Wallis test and the comments related to this analysis do not change in the revised version of the manuscript.

However, we agree with Editor and Reviewers that the Mann-Whitney U test is more appropriate here given that we consider only two categories.

Consequently, the following sentence:

“The non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test was applied to study whether the differences between *all-data* and *FT-data* medians were statistically significant.”

Was replaced with:

“The non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test was applied to study whether the differences between *all-data* and *FT-data* medians were statistically significant.”