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| **Response from author: …..**   1. Accepted and implemented 2. Accepted and implemented 3. Accepted and implemented 4. Rejected – at this point it is not clear if (b) will be offered 5. Same as 4 6. Accepted and implemented – figure removed 7. Rejected – something to be done in the future 8. Accepted and implemented 9. Same as 4 10. Accepted and implemented |

|  |
| --- |
| **Additional comments** *(not affecting the document content) e.g. recommendations for the future ……* |

**Detailed comments on the content:**

| **N°** | **Page** | **§** | **Observations** | **Reply from author** (correction / reject,  …) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Click here to Insert a new line above |  |

**English and other corrections:**

Note: English and typo corrections can be made directly in the document as comments.