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Reviewer's report:

General

In my opinion, the work still requires a major revision before it can be accepted, and I would urge the authors to rewrite it entirely from scratch rather than trying to salvage this manuscript. I realize that this review will be a disappointment to the authors, but in the long-run, they will benefit from the exercise.

Here's the problem. The paper is largely an expansion of the group's previously published paper in Nucleic Acids Research (Nucleic Acids Research, 2002, Vol. 30, No. 1 232-234). In order to publish another paper, the authors need to CLEARLY delineate their current work from their prior work (which they haven't really done).... and show how the current work provides a significant scientific advancement. They should also NOT include a lengthy discussion of prior work in this submission. This means doing a fresh rewrite of the paper.

*****************************************************************************

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)

The authors have ignored some of my prior comments, particularly in regard to clearly stating the intellectual property attributes of the IDML. It's not enough to indicate in the article that IDML is open access. The IDML specification should contain language indicating user rights. Often this is done by indicating that the IDML is distributed under the GNU or some other open source license. This is also typically accompanied by a copyright. This way, the user knows that the specification is owned by someone (so someone else can't claim ownership) and that the owner has specified the conditions of use (open access in this case).

*****************************************************************************

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

*****************************************************************************

What next?: Reject because scientifically unsound

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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