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Reviewer's report:

it is a very interesting article because it deals with an important topic clearly and rigorously. there are only a few changes that are necessary to improve its quality and readability and to help the reader understand its meaning, value and results.

my comments below.

title: appropriate

abstract: I would like the manufacturer and headquarters of the manufacturer to be clearly indicated for each product analyzed. moreover it is not acceptable to insert in the abstract "etc" for which the authors must remove it. in the abstract results it seems that the products analyzed are 9 but in reality they are 10, I prefer that the authors specify which products have obtained certain results, this can help the reader. the conclusions must be entirely supported by the results emerged from this research.

intro: page 4 line 4 must be removed "etc" because it is not acceptable in a scientific work. the last sentence also, that of the aims of the work, must be extended because the study evaluates 10 different commercially available products and this must be clear to the reader.

methods: you must introduce a section within the methods, in which you generally describe all ten products that you have analyzed, clearly indicating the producer and the location, the alleged characteristics (declared by the company). this section will be followed by the section already present in the methods relating to the analysis you have applied, which is suitable for the purpose. I therefore suggest structuring the methods in two sections, the first dedicated to the
products analyzed, with a generic presentation of their characteristics, and their components. the second to the analysis carried out.

Results: this section needs to be expanded and it is necessary that the authors clearly specify the names of the different products that have obtained certain results. also at the beginning it seems that the products are only 9 instead they are 10, why? remove "etc" because it is not scientifically acceptable.

discussion: certainly it is worthwhile and valid but the authors must insert one or two sentences of connection at the beginning of the discussion in which they introduce their work, it is not possible to start immediately from the results of the present work. what are the limits of this work? they should certainly be listed.

conclusions: the conclusions must summarize the results obtained in this work, therefore this section must be expanded and only at the end is it acceptable to insert a sentence like the one present here, on the consequences and the necessary measures at international level.

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

**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.

I am able to assess the statistics
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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