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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions:

While authors have addressed some of the reviewers’ concerns in the cover letter (and some in the manuscript), the main premise of the concerns hold: the conclusions do not follow from the research. The best conclusions that one could come to is that the supplemental EML has not been selected based on evidence OR according to the guidelines for selection. Even if I might agree with some of the conclusions, the methodology offers no opportunity to extrapolate any further conclusion then that. The points raised by the authors are interesting but is merely discussion.

Perhaps the language needs to be amended (including in the abstract) to highlight various options, and to clarify as a discussion. The conclusion or recommendations, however, ought to be amended.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

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