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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1) The hypothesis of the study should be explicitly stated 2) Please follow STROBE guideline by stating the type of study in the methods section. Is it a cohort, case-control, or cross-sectional study? 3) Outcomes are not defined with the methods section (or analysed appropriately in the results section) 4) Exposures were not clearly defined in the methods section 5) methods used have confused the exposures and outcomes. 6) Missing data was not described, explored or accounted for. 7) The statistical methods used were poorly described throughout. 8) P-values should be presented to 2 decimal places and effect estimates and 95%CI should be presented in all instances 9) The authors should discuss what the clinical utility of these findings could be 10) There should be more discussion of a possible mechanism 11) Explain what sort of future study might take us closer to a clinical utility
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