

Response to Reviewer's comments

Dear Marisa Nicolas and Reviewers, we would like to thank you again for all the comments and suggestions that you made regarding our research and we are glad to satisfy all the requests made by Reviewer 2 and almost all of the requests made by Reviewer 3.

Here follow the last comments made by Reviewer 3 and how we addressed them in the new version of the manuscript.

Reviewer 3:

- **Spite I consider that having good coverage is a desirable characteristic as well as having low Ns inserted in the genome, it seems that any of these advantage have an impact in variant discovery. The authors claimed that PipeCov will have a mayor impact on phylogeny analysis, but this is not demosntrated nor evaluated thus being just an hypothesis.**

- We included an observation in the manuscript. (Lines 203-208)

- **So, I thhink that a speed comparison should be included in order to evaluate the advantages of paying time efforts in the analysis if the intention is, for instance, to look for variants.**

- Although we did not have interest in compare the pipelines regarding time, we included this information in the manuscript. (Lines 212-216)

- **line 192:**

"of N's compared to the other pipelines. It is possible to no notice in Figure 3B that for some samples,"

i think that it should be

of N's compared to the other pipelines. It is possible to notice in Figure 3B that for some samples,

-We corrected in the manuscript. (Line 192)