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Reviewer's report:

Please number your comments and divide them into

- Major Compulsory Revisions
  - 1. The additions that the authors inserted need a very good edit. A number of noun/verb agreements need to be corrected. Authors need to do a line edit.
  - 
  - 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

- 1. The authors say they used Puerto Ricans from Puerto Rica for generalizability purposes, but do not comment on this in the discussion part of the paper.
  - 2.(p.11) authors say that ‘other reasons’ must account for recruitment problems. Briefly, what might be some of these other recruitment problems?

Statistical review

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

If you feel that the manuscript needs to be seen by a statistician, but are unable to assess it yourself then please could you suggest alternative experts in your confidential comments to the editors.

- Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

-X---Don’t know as I am not qualified to assess the statistics.
- No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published