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Reviewer’s report:

This is an important and interesting topic and an impressive amount of work has gone into the review/discussion.

My main concern about the MS is that it is very long and very detailed and I would like to see some strategic revision perhaps with a summary statement at the start of the paper stating the concerns and where the discussion is going - i.e. towards the 10R’s.

the many critical comments are stated emphatically but to my mind they are rather too emphatic when a more moderate position (at least acknowledging the potential for dispute) would be more effective.

I would say "choose your battles" by emphasising the most compelling cases because as a reader I felt that I was under a deluge of facts and cases. The same points could be equally well made with fewer examples.

The 10R’s are interesting an innovative but could they be reduced in detail as it is a very big table. In addition I don't think the author introduces (and defends) these well enough. So a clear objective from the outset should be the recommendation of the 10R's and spend a little time introducing them.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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