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**Reviewer's report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   YES

> 2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   YES

> 3. Are the data sound?
   Yes, as far as I can evaluate this

> 4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Sure, it does.

> 5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes.

> 6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Maybe the european discussion could stated here.

> 7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   The authors should search for more european studies dealing with their topic.

> 8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes.

> 9. Is the writing acceptable?
   As far as I can evaluate this, yes. Maybe a native should be asked for this