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Reviewer's report:

'The authors have made the effort to respond the extensive critiques of the reviewers. Unfortunately I feel that most of their additions have not improved the paper. The paper still remains abstract, the questions to be answered are not clear and the solutions proposed are abstract and unoperationalized. The intervention examples are described so briefly as to add little to the theoretical argument or approaches to the methodology. The efforts to simplify the text have not succeeded. The authors include by my count, no less than nine (9) definitions between Line 44 and 115. For the most part, these definitions do not make the concept less abstract but rather add additional complications and complexity. To build on one of the reviewer's points, there is a need for "substantive examples." I would suggest that the authors develop a paper that will "show how it should be done" by providing one detailed case in which they do evaluation in the right way (from their perspective).
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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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