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Reviewer's report:

The paper could have been transformed into a well written, thorough discussion about the disadvantages of responder analysis. However, I do not feel that the authors are interested in doing this. They do not want or feel it necessary to strengthen their case or consider any nuance. They simply want to write a pamphlet. This is a pity, because it means that the article simply repeats what has been written by others before.

I will therefore refrain from any further comments.

What next?: Reject as not of sufficient priority to merit publishing in this journal

Level of interest: Reject as not of sufficient priority to merit publishing in this journal

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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