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Reviewer's report:

General
The general argument presented in the paper is now much more balanced

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
These have been addressed, and although I am not entirely convinced I think the authors have made a good case for their methodology being of value.

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 without revision

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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