Review by

Does the paper make a novel contribution to the understanding of the topic under investigation?   [max 250 words]*

Yes it does. I'm very happy with the exploratory data approach the authors adopt. Another strength of the paper is that it guides the reader through the data exploration on the basis of relevant hypotheses that show engagement with the literature.

Is the empirical content of the paper sound (i.e. the data are collected and presented properly, the experiments are well designed, the statistics is well done, the examples contain no spelling mistakes, etc)? [max 400 words]*

I'm less convinced by the methodology of the paper, in particular because of the lack of information on how the data were aggregated. As readers, all we get is relative frequencies without any information on the number of datapoints per subject or information on the number of subjects per location. The lack of this information makes it impossible to properly assess the results, discussion and conclusion.

Is the argument coherent and sound, with no major flaws and/or shortcomings, within the context of the theoretical assumptions made by the author? [max 500 words]*
Cf. supra: it is impossible to properly assess the argumentation in the absence of fundamental information on the data that are taken into consideration.

Are there any relevant scholarly works that have been overlooked by the author? If the answer is YES, please provide the full references.*
No, I think the paper does justice to the state of the art.

Have you seen this paper, its content, the proposed analysis, or the conclusions published in other venues? [If your answer is YES, please add the relevant reference.]*
No, I have not.

If you accept the paper with minor revisions, please list the revisions you would advice (you are not required to proofread the paper)   [max 500 words]

I made a list of relevant revisions while reading (cf. attachment). These are primarily concerned with the introduction/motivation of the hypotheses in Section 1, with the absence of information on data aggregation and with the lack of a proper discussion of the limitations of the methodology.

If it turns out that there's not only a problem with the way the data are presented but also with the data themselves, I recommend the editors not to accept the paper. However, for the present version this is impossible to assess.