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Reviewer’s report:

I think that this item of correspondence is well-argued and sound.

I found it a little difficult to follow in places. In particular, I found the Appendix hard to follow. The problem is that now I have followed it, I cannot see where my difficulty lay. Perhaps the author should give this to a couple of people who have not seen it before and ask them whether they find anything unclear.

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

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

None

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

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Page 2, line 5. “Thus not matter” should be “Thus it does not matter”.

Page 2, line -2. I do not think that a conclusion a test giving a “not significant” result can be described as an “erroneous conclusion”. It is only erroneous if we conclude that because there is no significant difference, then there is no difference. This is always erroneous.

Page 5 I think it should be clarified that “item” refers to a response to a question by an individual.

Page 11. line “2. prove” should be “prove”.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions
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Quality of written English: Acceptable
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