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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revision 1:
Abstract>Background>line 3: "... responses assess" I believe you lack an "and"

Minor Essential revision 2:
Figure text: Figure 3 - revised traffic lights> Sentence 1: Please revise so that it is more readable.

In general:
The paper is interesting. Well written. Clear aim, sufficient methods and results section and clear conclusion.

I recommend publication.

I would love to see a coming project, where 1) the e-assessment i delivered mid-term. If the questions are well designed the end-term summative e-assessment would probably still be valid. So the setup could be with 2 e-assessments, one formative mid-term for blueprinted feedback and one summative end-term. 2) The mid-term assessment could be used for blueprinted feedback. 3) each blueprinted feedback report will undergo blinded peer-review with the purpose of getting peer recommendations on how to improve performance. This would give interaction and responsibility and force students to spend time on analyzing the reports.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
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