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Author’s response to reviews:

1. It should be made clear that the Fleiss' kappa opposed to Cohen's kappa was used and they should provide an interpretational help for readers in the method section to the classical interpretation of kappa by Landis and Koch already cited by the authors.

We have now specified that we use "Fleiss' kappa" (instead of "kappa") everywhere and added a cite in the Methods section. In the discussion now we explain that the criteria to define a "good" or "bad" kappa is arbitrary, and a little help to improve the understanding of kappa.

2. Figure 2 was clearly produced with SAS, however in the method section it is stated the analysis was done with STATA. The legend of Figure 2 or the main text should describe what exactly is shown with the box plots. I note there are outliers. As discussed by some of the reviewers, the outliers would deserve some more analysis and explanations.
The legend of figure 2 have been changed.

I'm afraid that we do not use SAS in our company, so, please, trust us when we say we are using Stata (licensed, of course). All the analysis and plots have been computed with Stata.

We think that a box plot is a common graphical way of describing a variable, and there's no need to give further explanations. In addition, the presence of outliers don't affect the interpretations of Figure 2 as box plots are made using percentiles 25, 50 and 75, that are not affected by extreme values. Summarizing, the box are similar between the raters. Although this is not a prove of good concordance, supports the idea that the differences between the raters when examining those 5 variables were little.