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Reviewer's report:

>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?

Because I am very naive about the statistical method used in the study, I am unsure.

>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?

I cannot judge it because my mother tongue is not English.

> In reviewing the revised manuscript, please consider whether the authors have answered your points sufficiently well to allow their manuscript to be published. As before, we would like you to divide your comments into the following three categories:

Yes, the authors have answered your points sufficiently. I have no more comments about revisions.

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

As far as statistical methods employed in data analysis is sound, this paper can be published as is.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English
I cannot judge it because my mother tongue is not English. (maybe needs some language corrections before being published)

Is it essential that this manuscript is seen by an expert statistician? If so, please give your reasons in your report.

Yes, this is because I cannot fully understand the statistical method in this paper
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