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Reviewer’s report:

The authors addressed the reviewers' comments well. There are only a few minor essential and discretionary revisions, which the authors can be trusted to make:

1) pg. 6 (first full paragraph): change the use of brackets [] to (), so not to confuse with the format of the references.

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).

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.
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