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Reviewer's report:

Much improvement has been brought to the draft with addressing many of the comments although there are still inherent limitations to what was done and presented.

I have one remaining required change that was not addressed i.e. in the second paragraph of the discussion as appears at top of page 11 of the revised manuscript, please replace ",suggesting that scientific quality was improved" by ",in order to improve scientific quality" or something similar. One should not suggest that quality was improved without evidence just because recommendations were implemented.

Also, I will repeat my suggestion to have the authors comment on the fact that the PI was chairing two of the advisory groups and how appropriate or problematic this is. Currently you just have added a comment about membership and chair in the "limitation and future research" section but perhaps you could contribute more experience on this from your case-study. This could be relatively easily added to the discussion and add useful info for the readership.
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