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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor,

We submit the revised R4 clean version of our manuscript.

Editor Comments:

(1) You state that you received approval for your study from educational and sanitary competent authorities; however, it is not clear whether any of these act as ethics committees. In addition to any approvals you received from these authorities, we would require ethics approval from an ethics committee. If this was not received, you would need to provide documentary proof that your study was discussed with a local ethics committee and that this was not required. You would also need to provide a statement to this effect within your 'Ethics approval and consent to participate' section of your manuscript.

As requested, the study was submitted to the local ethics committee CPP Sud-Est VI which stated on the 7th December: “The study does not raise any particular ethical problem and does not fall within the scope of the regulation governing biomedical research, within the meaning of
Article L.1121-1 and Articles R.1121-1 and R1121-2.” The original document was provided as supplementary material.

We added the following sentence at the end of the “Ethics approval and consent to participate” section of our manuscript:

The ethics committee Sud-Est VI Clermont-Ferrand stated that the study did not raise any particular ethical problem (2017/CE 37).