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Reviewer's report:

General

In the revised manuscript, the authors have made great efforts to address the issues that have arisen from peer review. Most of which have added to the robustness and readability of their study.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The authors now clearly state that the randomisation was done independently. However, as independent the individual might be in their randomisation, it is still possible that the student groups were not balanced at baseline (by sheer chance). Hence it is still important that data is provided about how similar or dis-similar students were at baseline.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

None.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

None.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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