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Reviewer’s report:

General

The authors did a good job revising the manuscript to be more consistent and clear. I think the current version is very nice. I accept their rebuttals to my suggestions for shortening the paper and re-organizing the paper. They certainly have a better feel for this topic and for what is necessary to include or not. I have only a few minor discretionary suggestions.

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

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)

1) There is a lot of passive voice in the paper that should be changed to the active voice.

2) In the Methods section on intra-rater reliability, I still think you should say that the F-measure approaches kappa as the number of true negatives gets large, because many of the readers will think of kappa when you talk about agreement. Then you could reference the Hripcsak article that describes that.

3) In the glossary under candidate term pair, insert “the” between “is” and “candidate” in “An automatically aligned term pair which is candidate…”

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

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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