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Reviewer’s report:

General
Most of my comments on first review have been accounted for and those have only been partially addressed can be easily addressed by the author.

I am a statistician and so have checked no for the question about whether it needs to be seen by a statistician

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1 The author has provided details of the random number generator which was something I mentioned. But I would still like a statement that the application has been thoroughly tested so the reader can have some assurance. This could just be a single sentence e.g. The application has been thoroughly tested (by an independent reviewer?)

2 Grammar is still a little awkward but OK. The most obvious corrections are
   a delete the in "the Martin Bland's web site"
   b Replace "management of higher groups number" with "Capability to deal with larger number of groups"
   c Replace "Randomize X function specify" with "Randomize X function is used to specify"
   d In discussion replace "Its use only" with "Its use is "
   e Other requirement "e.g. IE. " Use Internet Explorer for clarity

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
Declaration of competing interests:

As explained on first review in practical terms the conflict of interest is nil.