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Reviewer's report:

Comments to revised manuscript

I like to congratulate the authors of a highly improved manuscript both in terms of readability and clearer and a more transparent presentation of results.

I still have one major compliant regarding the lack of description of analysis. You write that you make an analysis 'to determine challenges' which I think you have done indeed but it’s not possible to see in the analysis description how you have interpreted the retrieved documents to identify challenges. I am sure that program descriptions which are some of the documents do not explicate challenges it’s something you infer from the texts. As far as I can tell from the results, first you used the documents to describe the current system and then you made some kind of critical assessment of the system (perhaps based on your knowledge in this area)? Anyway it’s still not clear how this interpretation took place. What defines a challenge, who made the interpretation and on which grounds - all aspects that should be described in a new revised version.

Smaller issues regard if it could be explicated both in the introduction and in the discussion how this studies adds to the existing literature. For example, the introduction says that 'the present study deals with the complete analysis…' - hence what was the problem of the existing studies - were they not complete?

Thirdly, I still recommend that the authors make the discussion shorter and more prioritized, to make the study even more interesting to the reader (and reflect this prioritization in a revised abstract as well).
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
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