# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

| Scientific quality | [  ] Grade A: Excellent    [  ] Grade B: Very good    [ Y ] Grade C: Good |
| | [  ] Grade D: Fair    [  ] Grade E: Do not publish |
| **Language quality** | [  ] Grade A: Priority publishing    [ Y ] Grade B: Minor language polishing |
| | [  ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing    [  ] Grade D: Rejection |
| **Conclusion** | [  ] Accept (High priority)    [ Y ] Accept (General priority) |
| | [  ] Minor revision    [  ] Major revision    [  ] Rejection |
| **Re-review** | [  ] Yes    [ Y ] No |

| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous    [    ] Onymous |
| --- | --- |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [    ] Yes   [ Y] No |

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study is well designed, but the small sample size affects the conclusions to be reliable. But the scientific approach for comparison is appreciated.