

Many thanks to the referees and the editor for their help in the process. These efforts definitely put the paper in better shape. We appreciate the support.

Response to Referee #2:

All my concerns and comments have been addressed except one minor editorial detail, which I still would like to mention here:

- in your new Table 1, I would argue that there is an error as "major issues" and "minor issues" are not exclusive. Indeed cases with 0 or 1 suspects and 1 outlier would qualify as "minor" and "major" issue at the same time. Can you please re-visit this table. In any case, I want to mention that the presence of this new table makes your procedure much clearer.

After that I suggest the manuscript for rapid publication. The authors have done a great job.

Thank you for detecting the error. The table has been updated to change ≥ 1 to >1 for the outlier numbers in the row for "minor issues".

Table 1. Data quality categorization based on the statistical characteristics

	<i>Number of Suspects</i>	<i>Number of Outliers</i>
<i>No issues/good quality</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>0</i>
<i>Minor issues/medium quality</i>	<i>1-3</i>	<i>0</i>
	<i>0-1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Major issues/not assured</i>	<i>any</i>	<i>>1</i>
	<i>≥ 4</i>	<i>any</i>