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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? - No
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? - Not particularly
3. Are the data sound? - Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? - No
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? - No
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? - Not clearly
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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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? - Not specifically
9. Is the writing acceptable? - NO

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
- Unfortunately at this point even with the revisions the authors have still not been able to integrate the comments and feedback given in a manner acceptable for publication. The language is not up to mark and unless they completely re revise the article and make the language more acceptable it cannot be published in BMC as it does not meet the required standards

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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