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| Are **the results** complete, |  |
| correctly described |  |
| were the statistical procedures correctly applied, |  |
| does the text agree with tables and figures, |  |
| does the chapter not contain redundant information? |  |
| Do **the tables and figures** contain critical information, |  |
| are they adequately described (units, definitions, abbreviations) |  |
| and are they self-explanatory ? |  |
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