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Reviewer’s report:

Authors did minor revisions with respect to the previous version, which have slightly improved it. Despite the results are negative, the paper is technically sound and the other reviewers consider the final result interesting for the community. On the other hand, semantic augmentation has been usually considered beneficial for document metrics and this work demonstrates that much more effort must be done to achieve good results with this technique. Finally authors show some future lines that could lead to better results.
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