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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   YES

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   YES

3. Are the data sound?
   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. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   YES

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   YES

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   YES

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   YES

In reviewing the revised manuscript, please consider whether the authors have answered your points sufficiently well to allow their manuscript to be published.
As before, we would like you to divide your comments into the following three categories:

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED

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

SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED

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

SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED

Once you have done this, there are also some questions for you to answer, including one that asks your advice on what the next step should be. Please bear in mind that it is journal policy to publish work deemed by peer reviewers to be a coherent and sound addition to scientific knowledge and to put less emphasis on interest levels, provided that the research constitutes a useful contribution to the field.

BMC Gastroenterology takes seriously issues of misconduct. Any manuscript or substantial parts of it submitted to the journal must not be under consideration by any other journal although it may have been deposited on a preprint server. The manuscript should not have already been published in any journal or other citable form, with that exception that the journal is willing to consider peer reviewing manuscripts that are translations of articles originally published in another language so long the consent of the journal in which the article was originally published has been obtained. Reviewers are asked to note whether they think duplication or plagiarism has occurred. Reviewers should also let the journal know if they believe that research has been falsified or manipulated, or if there are issues with the authorship or contributions towards the manuscript, such as the unacknowledged involvement of a medical writer.

NONE NOTED

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.