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Reviewer’s report:

I see no reason to alter my previous judgement.

The authors response that "The suggestion to conduct a systematic review is not appropriate, as it would greatly limit the information that we would have been able to include in our review (as many techniques have not been studied/reported in systematic reviews) and therefore we would have been unable to draw any inference about several approaches to CPE. ", is completely incorrect and demonstrates a profound misunderstanding of systematic review.

The approach is appropriate; this is why it was suggested, and is why so many papers included by the authors used the methodology. It need not "limit" any "information"; any such limits are determined by a review's inclusion criteria, set by the authors, and can be as broad as they like.

The statement - made twice - that the 3 other reviewers did not echo my comments appears to misunderstand the peer review process. As far as I am aware, authors are not asked to consider revisions based on the frequency with which they appear in peer review, but on their relevance. The other reviewers also made unique comments - presumably requiring less work, and so more acceptable to the authors. Also, as an editor of a journal myself, I would expect reviewers each to bring a different expertise to a review, and so not necessarily make the same points.

On point 2, the authors admission that a simple assertion is sufficient rather than simply providing a citation, as per standard academic practice, is equally inadmissible.

I am sorry that my review has prompted such a defensive, intractable stance from the authors, but I continue to stand fully by my opinions, in accordance with the peer review process.
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