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Reviewer's report:

General

I feel that the author makes some interesting and justified claims within this paper.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

I am happy that there are no major revisions that need ot be considered.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

I am unhappy with the authors use of S subscript (max) and more importantly S sub. (max) - 1. My understanding of this section (appendix) is that Smax - 1 is not necessarily the value (Smax) - 1 but is the second highest possible score. I would therefore like to see this re-written as S subscript (max-1). ( I hope that this paragraph is understandable in plain text format!). Basicall S sub(max-1) and not S sub(max) -1.

Table 1
The lower bound as presented in table 1, and as defined previously, is dependent on the sample size available. The confidence that we can ascribe to this value is therefore also dependent on the sample size. As such I feel that confidence intervals should be included for the lower bound estimates.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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