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Reviewer's report:

While the authors have gone at lengths to explain their responses to reviews and justify their proposal, they have not adequately declared them in the publication. I recommend a separate section or paragraph outlining all of the limitations with at least some level of detail. One of the major issues in authorship ethics surrounds power dynamics between senior/junior individuals or faculty/trainees likely accounts for a number of unethical authorship practices. Simply putting the onus on authors to resolve contributions in a "collegial way" is not being done. While I agree that the model motivates researchers to talk about authorship, it doesn't mean it will lead to a more ethical outcome. In fact, it might wind up displacing those with less power and authority if their contributions are bordering on sufficient/insufficient. A second shortcoming also worth noting is where two reviewers discussed the difficulty in quantifying the value of a research contribution. This too is an inherent limitation that should be clearly noted in the paper. The authors spend much of the manuscript space explaining their model and how it works but really don't perform an adequate ethical analysis of how and why this model, other than its ease of application, really addresses the systemic problems we have in authorship ethics.
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