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Reviewer's report:

In general, the replies were sensible. However, the revised manuscript still has some issues that should be considered.

1. P(age) 4, l(ine) 52. Delete [s] on [reflects] to read [reflect].

2. P 6, l 108. Replace [fails to] by [does not]. Since this idea is not yet common in the literature, then how can someone fail it?

3. P 9, l 185 and 194. Replace [range] by [min and max]. It would also be okay to use minimum and maximum rather than the short forms.

4. P 11, after l 251. Since the raw data seems to contain outliers in the data, it might be better to suggest reporting median and quartiles since the mean and sd can be distorted by outliers. When outliers are detected with say a boxplot, then the whiskers might also be suggested with a note that the axis contained an outlier and its magnitude.

5. P 13, l 301. Add [GP] from Table 1.

6. P 16, last column of Table 2. Why not at least add the median and maybe the IQR. If some of the values seem to be outliers, why not note them in some way.

7. P 16, l 376. Why not add the software [Microsoft Paint with the version number] you used to generate the PRECIS wheel. Maybe you might give others permission to copy your not marked up version, attributing it to you.