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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
   Well defined, but not entirely original

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
   Yes

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
   Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes

7. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes

The paper is well written and methodologically sound. It is rather long for the size of the research question and in a paper journal I would recommend shortening for accessibility though I understand there is no imperative to do so for BMC.
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Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
None
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Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
None

----------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Shortening for readability
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Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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