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**Reviewer's report:**

Please see the comment in the attach manuscript.

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes, but inconsistency throughout the paper.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   The methods are appropriate and well described.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes, but not support the benefit of PPV over the pressure group.

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
   Yes. But very difficult to understand.

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes.

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes.

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes.

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   No.

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   No.

10. Is the writing acceptable?
    No, it needs major revision by native spoken.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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