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Reviewer’s report:

General
This was a very well-written paper, which makes a significant contribution to an important ongoing debate. The examples used are highly relevant and help to develop the points made. The authors are also to be commended on the attention they have paid to enumerating the limitations of their work and the implications for future debate.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept without revision

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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