

Editor's Comments:

It is apparent that the Discussion of the revised manuscript is mostly an inappropriately long description of the results of the study, and does not adequately attempt to discuss the significance of the present findings within the context of other studies, nor adequately discuss the biological significance of these results. For example, results of Regression modelling analysis should not be presented in the Discussion, as the authors stated in the feedback form BJMMR_26276_v2. Results of Regression analysis and all other results should be presented in the Results section, either in the form of tables, figures or in the text of the Results section. There are only 2 tables in the Results section, and no figures. It is highly recommended that the Results section should be further revised to present all the relevant analyzed data from the study, rather than filling the Discussion section with descriptions of the Results. The Discussion also need considerable revision to remove detailed descriptions of the results from this section. I further recommend that the authors should read relevant publications on the subject in order to understand how a well-constructed Discussion should be written. Authors should read, for example: Vlachova et al, 2015; Boney et al, 2005; Plagemann et al, 1997; and as many other relevant published studies as they can find, in order to understand how to revise their Discussion accordingly.

Authors' Feedback:

The discussion has been corrected. Results are presented in the results section. I have read your recommended publications and whilst I do not agreed that every discussion should follow those formats I have revamped the discussion.