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Reviewer’s report:

General I trust that another reviewer on this article is one with more statistical expertise than myself.

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

None.

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

Under Results, Single marker analysis, 2nd from last line. Table 1 shows results for TT only but not TS? TS also had a significant difference in the frequency of the allele in question did it not (p=0.004 in text)? However, this data is not in Table 1 as indicated in the text describing it.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Statistical analysis of allelic differences is somewhat complex and difficult (for me) to follow. There will be others who are interested in this work but who know little of these tests. For convenience, more detail (even brief overview or description) could be helpful to readers for ease-of-reference.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes
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