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**Reviewer's report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? The question is well defined.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? The methods are appropriate.
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? The discussion may be improved on the basis of the recent published results.
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? NO.
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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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? The manuscript needs English revision.

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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