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Reviewer’s report:

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined? yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work? yes
3. Are the data sound and well controlled? yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? yes
6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? yes
7. Is the writing acceptable? yes

In reviewing the revised manuscript, please consider whether the authors have answered your points sufficiently well to allow their manuscript to be published.

Yes

No further revisions

General

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

Nil

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

Nil

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Nil
What next?: Accept without revision

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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