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Reviewer's report:

General
The paper is much improved. Thanks to the authors for clarifying the details of the methods. A few places in the text still refer to the sample (or subsamples) as "random" when the authors mean "not biased in any apparent way" or "similar" to the source population.

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

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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