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Reviewer's report:

General

On every substantive point raised in my review, the authors' response is essentially to justify why they did not make any change. I believe that the authors' conclusions from the MATCH data are extremely misleading and not well substantiated by their analyses. Their polemical tone has been historically shared by Stanton Peele, a popular writer rather than a researcher, who apparently approved of the article in original form. Some appropriate revisions were made in response to the Moyer review. But all of my original concerns about this article remain and were not addressed by the authors, except to reject them as unfounded. This comes down to an editorial decision. I do not recommend publication of this article in its present form, and do not wish to review it again unless quite substantive changes are made to address the concerns that I raised in my original review.

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)