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Reviewer’s report:

General

The authors have adequately addressed my previous concerns. I recommend publication.

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

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

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

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

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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

What next?: Accept without revision

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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