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Response to Reviewers’ Comments

The authors would like to thank the reviewers for their comments and suggestions. We have changed the document according to the comments as indicated by highlighting and track changes. Below, please find an outline of how we have addressed the comments:

Referee 2:

1) pg. 6 (first full paragraph): change the use of brackets [ ] to (), so not to confuse with the format of the references.
The brackets have been changed – refer to track changes.

2) pg. 7 (2nd paragraph, re: reasons provided for rating this criteria low): To follow other sections, would suggest not placing statements in “” and not italicizing. This will keep formatting consistent and distinguish statements from the criteria (which are italicized and placed in quotes).
The suggested change in formatting has been made and highlighted in green.

3) pg. 8 (1st paragraph under Round 2): italicize 'the' after 'there was low agreement for two criteria'. Also, add a : after criteria before listing.
The change in formatting has been made and highlighted in green. A colon has been added – refer to track changes.

Editorial request:
A statement regarding the ethical approval has been included in the methods section and is highlighted in green.