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Reviewer's report:

Re-review:
The authors address most of my previous comments very well.

1. Does the software address a novel task? Alternatively, if there is already software available that performs this task, does the software outperform it in terms of speed, reliability, efficiency, or breadth of application?
   This software does address a novel task, and seems to do so very well.

2. Is it easy to use?
   This is not an open access tool, and I could not get in to browse and see the functionality from within. I therefore do not have first hand experience in whether it is easy to use or not, but the manuscript tells us how many collaborations it has supported, and one would imagine this number would have been far smaller if the tool had not been relatively easy to use.

3. Does it satisfactorily address the task or application the authors intend?
   It seems so, given the figures of usage presented in the manuscript.

4. Is the software freely available for non-commercial use (note that this is a condition of publication)? And is the availability of the software and any restrictions on use clearly stated in the manuscript?
   It is restricted, and this is clearly stated in the manuscript.

5. Does the manuscript clearly describe the problem the software is designed to address
   Yes.

6. Does the manuscript clearly describe how the software is implemented?
   Yes.

7. Does the manuscript clearly describe how the software performs and its advantages / limitations over existing applications?
   The manuscript describes how the software performs, and compares the software against a few others. I would like to see the Team Science Toolkit mentioned, and SciVal (which has now merged with ViVo) given more than a
cursory mention.

8. Does the manuscript state the software's operating requirements
Yes.

9. Are the discussion and conclusions of the manuscript well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes.

10. Do the title and abstract of the manuscript accurately convey what has been found?
Yes.

11. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes.

Please make your review as constructive and detailed as possible in your comments so that authors have the opportunity to overcome any serious deficiencies that you find.
I did this in the previous review, and the authors have answered most of my comments thoughtfully and well.

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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