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Reviewer’s report:

General

The authors have responded to my previous comments and have clarified or revised the manuscript as indicated. I have no further comments prior to publication.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
none

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
none

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
The reader would benefit from a more focused discussion about the implication of these findings for more widespread registry adoption. What should be the next steps?

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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