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Reviewer’s report:

TITLE. The title is adequate, specific, clear and attractive, reflecting the content of the work.

ABSTRACT is of right length and contains the adequate details.

INTRODUCTION. This part of the manuscript introduces the reader directly to the point. The objective of the study is clearly stated.

METHODS are ethically approved and presented in details, enabling the readers to repeat the research. The number of participants is large enough.

RESULTS are clearly stated, data are analyzed statistically and interpreted accurately. Presentation in the text, figures and tables are easily comprehensible.

DISCUSSION is of appropriate length, and answers the question posed in the Introduction.

CONCLUSION is justified and logical.

REFERENCES are carefully selected, relevant and fairly represent current knowledge in the field.

Taking as a whole, this manuscript, clearly written (and in good English, too) and easily understandable, merits the attention of audience interested in actual and interesting topic the authors are dealing with.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest 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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