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Reviewer's report:

This is an editorial review, concentrating on reporting as ethical approval is in place already.

Firstly, thank you for addressing the comments of the previous reviewer.

Re. my own reporting review I've been through the SPIRIT checklist against your manuscript and while most things are fine, I've noticed a few parts of the SPIRIT checklist that need attention:

1. Any items that are marked 'N/A' need at least a few words of explanation. For example, if the reason for the N/A for SPIRIT item 5d is that there is no steering committee etc then it's helpful to see 'N/A - there is no steering committee'. Please add a few words of explanation against all the N/As.

2. I couldn't find the protocol version number. I can see the registration number but is this version of the protocol Version 1, or a later version?
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An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English
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Acceptable
Quality of figures

All images and figures within the manuscript should be genuine i.e. without evidence of manipulation. No specific feature within an image may be enhanced, obscured, moved, removed, or introduced. If you have concerns about the veracity of the figures you should choose the first option below.

Statistical review

Is it essential that this manuscript is seen by an expert statistician? If so, please give your reasons in your report.
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