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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors have addressed almost all of my points adequately. Below, I have three that remain.

I previously suggested the authors use exact p-values and drop the asterisks to display significance. The authors disagreed and quoted the BMJ guide as an excuse for not displaying p-values. This is not standard, regardless of their quotation. No one up to date in the methods world uses threshold p-values anymore, except below <0.001. If a reader can't figure out statistics on their own, then no amount of asterisks will help them interpret a paper accurately. Do yourself a favor and change them to exact p-values. Further, why would you use exact p-values in some tables and thresholds with asterisks in others?

I previously suggested that the authors reference using standard medical bibliographic style. You made this change, but keep the page numbers in the main text. This is inappropriate. These go with the exact reference.

I still think you should drop the Mann quote, especially as it just repeats the sentence before, almost verbatim.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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