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Review comment: In your previous version you stated "National and regional ethical approval was gained for this study," however it is now stated that ethics was not needed. If you did not need formal ethics approval please confirm that this complies with national guidelines and provide a reference which supports this. Alternatively, supply a statement that says that a local ethics committee ruled that no formal ethics approval was required in this particular case, including the name of the ethics committee.

Response: The requested ethics statement and details have now been included in the Declarations section on page 19 of the manuscript.