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Reviewer's report:

General
The authors have dealt with a significant number of issues raised in the comments. Although the authors now have mentioned a goal of the study, the problem remains that this goal is still not supported by a hypothesis or a problem definition. Why is it useful to have this information? What is the problem that lies underneath and is to be tackled by the results of the study?
The authors state that data first of all can be used to make an assessment of nationwide patterns. Can they state why this is necessary? Surprisingly, while this assessment is announced, I cannot find it in the results or in the discussion.

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

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?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No