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Reviewer's report:

I greatly appreciated your changes of the manuscript and I evaluated that your improvements really increase its readability. Nevertheless, I still observe an aspect to be adequately considered.

One original comment about skewness analysis was: “The authors provide an alternative way to analyze differences in items among subjects across years. This alternative methodology seems to need a formal, methodological demonstration and explanation. In other words, if this methodology - as it seems - is here introduced for the first time, some comparative analyses to evaluate its goodness (with a formal analytical proof of its coherence) are required. On the other hand, if this formal approach has already been explored by previous literature, the references have to be considered and discussed. On the bottom of page 10 authors assert: “Previous studies found that skewness analysis is useful in evaluating dissimilarity of examinee groups”, but no reference is here reported”.

Your response was: “As suggested by the reviewer, we have added the reference [24] to the revised manuscript. Readers who are interested in the skewness analysis in group comparison can practice it with an Excel-VBA module. In the discussion of the previous published paper, there are detailed discussion of the similarities and discrepancies against t-test and ANOVA”.

While I consider reference [24] and Excel-VBA module two important points to reply on comments, I would suggest improving your manuscript with a formal analytical proof about relevance of skewness analysis in evaluating dissimilarity of examinee groups. Indeed, in my opinion, reference [24] cannot be considered an entirely satisfactory response to the problem.

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests