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Reviewer's report:

Most comments have been adequately accounted for. However, I suggested a mediation analysis in my previous review, which I guess was performed in a misleading way and does not add anything to the paper.
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A methodological paragraph was added about a mediation analysis, but I don't think this concept was used correctly. The first part refers indeed to a mediation analysis, but the second part, with the inclusion of interaction terms, refers to a modification analysis, i.e., checking whether the impact of the current ratio is modified by year of analysis.
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The significance of interaction terms does not allow confirm the mediation effect, it is something different.

Conclusion

Neither the mediation nor the modification analyses were subject to interpretations in the Discussion, and I guess they were presented in a misleading way. For the clarity of the paper, I suggest removing these analyses, i.e., removing the Models 2 and 3, and including the current ratio in Model 1.
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