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Reviewer's report:

General comment
This is a very interesting article which undoubtedly deserves to be published. However, I suggest that the authors consider a few minor points, which are listed below in order of appearance in the text and not in order of importance.

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

------------------------------------------------------------------
Minor Essential Revisions

1. Page 1: the abstract is not structured. Maybe this is not a journal requirement?
2. Page 1, line 14: I am not sure what is meant by: “…included 6 priority 2 items (4 new ones)…”.
3. Page 4, lines 8 and 21: reference is made to “Appendix 1” and “Appendix 2”, respectively, but these do not appear in the paper.
4. Page 4, lines 33-42: I personally have some difficulty in correctly interpreting this paragraph, particularly with regards to the references to Tables 4 and 5, which I find unclear (see below).
5. Page 6, line 50: reads: “…three very interesting papers…”; however, only two bibliographical references are provided (line 51), namely: “[93]” e “[94]”.
6. Page 8, line 37: there is a minor error in “The costal prominence…”: please remove the adjective “costal” because the term “prominence” in the sentence refers to both the thoracic hump and the lumbar hump.
7. Pages 11 and 13, Tables 2 and 6 present a typing error: “Bunnel”, should be spelt “Bunnell” in both tables.
8. Pages 12-13, Tables 3, 4 and 5: glancing through the columns and rows of data, I find it hard to understand the Tables’ overall meaning and message. I personally find the Tables insufficiently intuitive or comprehensible, even after reading the captions and explanations given as footnotes to the Tables. They should be completely revised, at the authors’ discretion, with the addition of an adequate legend to facilitate comprehension.

------------------------------------------------------------------
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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