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**Reviewer’s report:**

Revisons= minor essential

The authors clearly improved their manuscript; however, I feel there are still some confusion on the organization of the manuscript. First, the purpose of the study is “lost” in the background and other experience. Second, the flow charts should be clear of inclusion, non-inclusion, exclusion and reasons. Finally, authors should discussed their limits and their strength (not only admit limits but discussion about the characteristics of their sample, the literature…). I think a methodologist could be helpful (including the one from the famous MRC unit).

Please also put references at the end of sentences in the text, and P< 0.05 and significant in the same sentence (define the P level in the method section is sufficient).

**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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