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Reviewer's report:

The article reads well although there are still a few areas where the language could be polished - I assume this will get picked up in the editorial process, although one or two of my suggestions are along these lines.

- Authors should include a reference for Cohen's kappa on Page 7 (I had a quick check and didn't see one though I may have missed it, apologies if so)

- Table 3. Authors should state what the +/- refer to (confidence intervals?)

- Page 11: I would say "logistic regression model" (bit simpler and should be understood by all)

- Page 3: Should say "fitted a logistic regression.." (i.e. include "a")

- For Tables 5 and 6, authors should state what scale the coefficients are on (logit?)

- Figure 1 title: wherever authors use the word "in", replace with "at"

- This is optional and would involve a little extra work: I think the figures with the logistic curves would benefit from the inclusion of confidence intervals. This is a judgement for the authors and editors - I can see that the graph might get cluttered where there are two separate logistic curves. So I think it would be a useful addition, but one for the authors/editors to decide.
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