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Reviewer’s report:

Whilst this study does not produce drastically novel data, the study is well conducted, clearly presented and the findings do add to the body of existing data. In particular, the background section is clear and concise, and the methods section is detailed, clear and replicable.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Nil

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Some very minor attention to grammar is required, for example abstract, line 3.
2. In the results section of your abstract you need to define what the values are that are given in line 1. Is this mean delay (and standard deviation)? Also, the separation of participants into group 1, 2 and 3 does not make sense in the abstract, though is clear in the full methods section.
3. The results are mostly presented clearly, though I’m not clear about the legend in table 2. The star and crosses say that they relate to p-values but are located next to mean and standard deviations. Do you mean that the p-values for the comparison of these means are <0.05. If so, for what comparisons are the p-values that are presented? Or have I misunderstood this? Clarity on this would be helpful.

Discretionary Revisions

Nil

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

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

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