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Reviewer's report:

General
Good. I thought the changes were effective for focusing the paper on the main results of the research, and clarifying their importance. In addition, removing the section on history of classification was helpful, as it detracted from the main point of the article.

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)

The second and third paragraphs of the introduction could be removed -- they lose focus from the research.

The parenthetic remarks in the Objective and Methods sections of the abstract should be removed. The abstract should be as concise as possible.

Paragraph 4 of the introduction (begins "In 2004") lists results by Chapman. However, it should be made clear that this is a different comparison. I don't think the performances of the systems are directly comparable.

First sentence of Result section is redundant.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No