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Reviewer’s report:

The content and quality has improved compared to the last version. However, the organization, structure and the flow remain problematic, in my view. The quality of written English is a problem; I strongly recommend that authors have this work proof read and edited by a professional editor. There are numerous spelling errors, awkward and long sentences, etc. There are just too many to list them here. Are you suing English UK or English USA, or neither? Please address the quality of writing, the manuscript should not be printed unless proof-read and the content is adjusted accordingly.

I still did not quite understand why exactly the authors could not reach consensus among their participants... just please state the answer briefly and clearly, without taking the discussion elsewhere.

In the discussion section please discuss the balance between simplicity and complexity that you evoked in your title. I recommended it the first time I reviewed this work.

Good luck with it.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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