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Reviewer's report:

This is a much improved manuscript. The revised document provides greater clarity and reveals the contribution to knowledge of this work more clearly. I am largely satisfied that the authors have responded effectively to the major concerns that I and other reviewers have raised. There are 2 lingering concerns which I will leave up to the discretion of the authors and journal editors. They are not sufficiently significant as to warrant mandatory revisions prior to publication.

Discretionary:
1) The method and results section reads much better, but I wish more detail was provided on the operationalization of the evaluation. They have partially responded to the concern, but could provide a little more information as to how judgments were rendered. I have no problem with the fact some judgments are necessarily subjective.

2) All of the reviewers have to some extent requested the use of examples. The authors have partially satisfied that request. The examples (often only a sentence) add much to the clarity, especially for readers who are not expert in this area. A few more strategically placed examples or illustrations of a particular observed problem would be helpful.

Minor Essential Revisions:
There are a few typos and grammatical errors, including:

p. 19. Because of this it we frequently made use of UML activity diagrams in the knowledge acquisition phase, and translated the contents of these into PROforma during system implementation.

p. 25 PROfoma process description

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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