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|  | 7 | Ex.summary | This section should contain also a summary of the findings.  |  |
|  | 14 | 4.2 | Please, explain from the beginning the meaning of “domains” in this context |  |
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|  | 21 | 4.2.2 | It is not clear why these domains have been excluded. |  |
|  | 23 | 5.1 | Are the entities who “monitor and manage data” the data providers? If so, I would explicitly call them that way. |  |
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|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**English and other corrections:**
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Abstract: “top-up” should be “top-down”.

Pg33, “at national institution” should be “at national institutions”