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Reviewer's report
> ........................
> 
> > Please number your comments and divide them into
> >
> > - Major Compulsory Revisions
> >
> > The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example, additional necessary experiments or controls, statistical mistakes, errors in interpretation.
> >
> >
> > - Minor Essential Revisions
> >
> > The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.
> >
> >
> > - Discretionary Revisions
> >
> > These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.
> >
> > Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the questions below constitute the report, bearing your name, that will be forwarded to the authors and published on the site if the article is accepted.
> >
> >
What next?

Based on your assessment of the validity of the manuscript, what do you advise should be the next step?

- Accept without revision
- Accept after discretionary revisions (which the authors can choose to ignore)
- Accept after minor essential revisions (which the authors can be trusted to make)
- Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions
- Reject because scientifically unsound
- Reject because too small an advance to publish (note that BMC Public Health will publish all sound studies including sound negative studies)

Level of interest

BMC Public Health has a policy of publishing all scientifically sound research whatever its level of interest. However if you choose one of the first three categories below, we may ask the authors if they would like the manuscript considered instead for the more selective journal BMC Medicine.

- An exceptional article (of the kind that might have warranted publication in such journals as Nature, Cell, Science, New England Journal of Medicine, British Medical Journal)
- An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field (of the kind that might be found in the leading specialist journal in its field, such as Immunity, Development, Journal of Clinical Investigation, Gastroenterology)
- An article of importance in its field
- An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
- An article of limited interest
- An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal
Quality of written English

As we do not charge for access to published research, we cannot undertake the costs of editing. If the language is a serious impediment to understanding, you should choose the first option below, and we will ask the authors to seek help. If the language is generally acceptable but has specific problems, some or all of which you have noted, choose the second option.

- Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
- Needs some language corrections before being published
- Acceptable

Statistical review

Is it essential that this manuscript be seen by an expert statistician?

- Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
- Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
- No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests

We ask all peer reviewers of medical papers to declare their competing interests in relation to the paper they are reviewing. The peer reviewer declaration is included in the report bearing your name that will be sent to the authors, and published on our website if the article is accepted.

In the context of peer review, a competing interest exists when your interpretation of data or presentation of information may be influenced by your personal or financial relationship with other people or organizations. Reviewers
should disclose any financial competing interests but also any non-financial competing interests that may cause them embarrassment were they to become public after the publication of the manuscript.

> When completing your declaration, please consider the following questions:

> - Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper, either now or in the future?

> - Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper, either now or in the future?

> - Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript? Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

> - Do you have any other financial competing interests?

> - Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

> If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

> Open peer review

> ----------------

> Submission of this report is taken as confirmation that you are happy for your signed report to be posted on the BMC Public Health website as part of the pre-publication history of this article.

I have no further comments to make about this paper and would be happy
to see it published.

Peter Jackson