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Reviewer's report:

Reviewers report
> -----------------
> *The study is well done and very clearly presented.*
> The performed teams were of course only performed very shortly before the training, so they were not real teams who know each other or trained together. The impact might have been even higher. This could be highlighted more.
> - Major Compulsory Revisions
> - The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example, additional necessary experiments or controls, statistical mistakes, errors in interpretation.
> - Minor Essential Revisions
> - The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.
> - Discretionary Revisions
> - These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.
Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the questions below constitute the report, bearing your name, that will be forwarded to the authors and published on the site if the article is accepted.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.