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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are major issues

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are major issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a technically sound contribution?

Maybe - with major revisions
PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Overall, this is a good study that has some interesting and important implications. The measures used are appropriate, and the methods are sound and well designed to avoid confounding etc. However, I have some issues with the analysis. Firstly, I am not sure why Wilcoxon has been used for between-groups comparisons, since this is a within-groups variance test. Secondly, there is no justification given for the use of a non-parametric, as opposed to a parametric, test of difference. Finally, there is no mention of adjustment for familywise error. In this study, there are many unadjusted comparisons being made, so I'd expect at least one or two of them to crop up through random error alone. Given that the conclusions are strongly predicated on the results, I think these issues need to be addressed.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

The major issues I have drawn out are connected with the analysis, as per my previous comments.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?  
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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