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Reviewer’s report:

General

This is an interesting paper which is clearly written. The analysis is sophisticated, clearly described, and appropriate.

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)

None.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

I’d prefer if table 3 either listed exact p-values, or gave confidence intervals (or both). Some of the p-values are considerably less than 0.05, but this is the only level that is given. However, I'm aware that this may make the table rather cumbersome. It might be possible just for the intervention effect though.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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