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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for revising your manuscript in response to the reviewers' suggestions. In my view, this already excellent paper has still significantly gained in the process, and needs no further revision if not the following.

With regard to the authors' response to #30, and the opposition of "a number of manuals or reports" versus "scientific literature" in their revised text, I would hesitate to preserve the qualifier "scientific" only to contributions published in peer-reviewed journals, regardless of my great respect for and endorsement of the principle of peer-review. There is much rubbish far from science to be found in peer-reviewed journals, and not few book chapters present profound contributions to the scientific literature. In my view, it is neither necessary nor helpful to deny the latter the status of scientific contributions. However, from my side it is at the discretion of the authors whether they want to make another revision of this passage.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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