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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions
the manuscript has improved, but I have still some of the same remarks as in the previous reviews.

1) more information about the Controls were asked for and is not presented. I think it at least should include sex and age (page 6).

2) Under Methods Moral sense test (page 8) the two different tests put up in Table 4 are named differently and also later on in the manuscript page 13. On page 13 they are named Intended harm and Foreseen harm and this seems to be the best way to name them. This should also be made clear in the discussion page 17 so that it is very clear what is being discussed.

3) The Discussion should also have more rigor in naming the tests being discussed (as above 2). A good example is p 18 were the tests for emotion perception are put in brackets.

4) Last line second paragraph: Happiness is quoted twice. One of them should instead be fear.
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