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Reviewer's report:

General
The authors have greatly improved the clarity and focus of this paper -- however, I spotted a couple of minor points which could still be improved -- these are noted under discretionary revisions.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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)

The quality of an abstract is typically DEEMED through the expert judgement of two or more independent reviewers.

This seems odd wording -- I suggest DETERMINED or ASSESSED would be better

Each submitted abstract is assigned three independent reviewers from the bank of volunteer CAEP reviewers. One of the AUTHORS (CS) administers the review process and attempts to prevent conflict-of-interest situations during the reviewer assignment phase.

On first reading, I took this to mean one of the authors of the abstract ... perhaps you could change this to read 'An ADMINISTRATOR (CS) coordinates the review process ..'

The pool of reviewers remained largely the same throughout the four years with the addition of several new reviewers in 2004.

This is ambiguous -- either the pool remained largely the same, or it did not. Would it be more accurate to write 'The pool of reviewers remained largely the same throughout THE FIRST THREE YEARS, but several new reviewers were added in 2004'?
What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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