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**Reviewer's report:**

Thank you for these clarifications.

Minor comments to be addressed which will further improve the quality of the paper:

point 2) The authors should speculate in possible limitations of the KERN framework in the discussion

point 5) add the answer to the paper for clarification. This is extremely interesting for the reader and will improve the paper so that it can be interpreted in a more general concept.

point 7) this limitation should be mentioned in the paper. It is an important part of the context.

point 8) add the answer to the paper for clarification. This is extremely interesting for the reader and will improve the paper so that it can be interpreted in a more general concept.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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