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1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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3. Are the data sound?
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5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
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- **Major Compulsory Revisions**
  See comments on the attached draft.
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- Major Compulsory Revisions

All methodological issues (see attachments) should be addressed. Have a limitations section under Discussion.

- Minor Essential Revisions
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- Discretionary Revisions
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Level of interest

- An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English

- Acceptable

Statistical review

- No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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