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Reviewer's report:

General

The paper is o.k. now.

[Frankly, another reviewer has lured the authors into quoting more confidence intervals than is reasonable. In my view one, should only supply CIs when the quantity being estimated is externally interpretable (as opposed to being design-dependent or ephemeric), AND the audience is expected to have a genuine interest in this particular quantity, AND the 95% warranty against random error is unlikely to be eroded by systematic error (bias).]
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