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Paper review

Thank you for the opportunity to review this revised paper. I have just commented on the issues I previously took issue with and left other sections blank.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

   There is now a much clearer description of methods.

   In terms of ethical approval the authors have now made it clear that the Taiwan National Science Council approved the study but it still needs to be explicit that this was ethical approval that was secured.

   In the section on analysis the last sentence “Finally, to release the information the texts were presented in their entirety” is still unclear to me despite the author’s explanation.

3. Are the data sound?

   The reorganization of themes and the use of sub headings is much clearer.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
There is now a far greater and appropriate use of a wide range of literature that is very helpful.

I think the structure of the findings section is now much clearer although I am less sure about the use of the framework previously developed by other researchers. The authors seem to suggest the framework as emergent from this set of data. The original framework authors are acknowledged in the introduction as is the use of this framework as a conceptual tool. However I think reference to it again, perhaps in the discussion, is important. Mention could be made of the degree of coherence with this framework and the present study.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
This has now been addressed.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
The title is now clearer.

I am still though not convinced of the use of either term ‘virtual’ or ‘contractual vertical’ with no reference to any literature that assists with an understanding of the term.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
The paper is now much clearer although I remain unclear as to the meaning of the term ‘mal-competition’ on page 21.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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