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Reviewer's report:

General

Most of the concerns raised in the original review have been addressed. In particular, Table 1 helps to better explicated the "background" for the ten principles, and the authors have also done a better job of describing the particulars of the Delphi process and how the "ethical language" was introduced.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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 article would be substantially enhanced if the authors would, in their conclusion, address the issue of how they believe their recommendations should be operationalized -- i.e. would report cards that take into account the authors' ethical concerns look different? (that is, would the data to be collected be different), would they be SCORED differently? or would they be PUBLICIZED differently?

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

Statistical review: No
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