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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Good and relevant question
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Very detailed description
3. Are the data sound? Impressive data set, a lot of work must have been done behind the screens
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes, more than that, excellent work
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Very good description
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes, they are
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes, they do at several places in the paper
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes

- Minor Essential Revisions
In "determining minimum sample size the authors refer to a previous study without reference

Level of interest: An exceptional article

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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