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Reviewer’s report:

General
The question had been addressed in previous publications (e.g. Pal et al) but perhaps worth revisiting to see if practice has improved

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
Authors need to include work and references of previous reports as indicated above. Then discuss if and how current practice is different from that reported before.

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

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 whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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