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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, BUT BACKGROUND AND METHOD ARE FAR TOO LONG, CAN BE MUCH SHORTER
> 3. Are the data sound? THE PANEL MEMBERS ARE NOT VERY WELL AND RATIONALLY CHOSEN, WHY THE PROFESSORS AND RESEARCHERS, WHY NOT MORE CLINICIANS? THERE IS NOT CONTROL FOR REAL CLINICAL EXPERIENCE BY THE PANEL MEMBERS. THE STATEMENTS EVALUATED BY THE PANEL ARE TOO GENERAL NOT VERY SPECIFIC AND THE RESULT IS THAT WHAT YOU GET IS COMMON SENSE. PROBABLY THE LITERATURE REVIEW IS TOO LIMITED
> 4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? OKAY
> 5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? TOO LONG
> 6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? YES, BUT WAS IS LEFT OUT IS THAT THE RESULTS ARE NOT VERY INTERESTING AND HOW THIS IS POSSIBLE.
> 7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? NOT ENOUGH REVIEW OF THE PANIC LITERATURE, STATEMENT ARE TOO GENERAL
> 8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? GUIDELINES SUGGEST MORE THAN WHAT WE GET
> 9. Is the writing acceptable? YES.