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Reviewer’s report:

General

I have read over the revisions and believe the authors address most of my concerns. I continue to think that the SCT in its current format has very limited utility for educational assessment.

The article however does not specifically deal with applications for the SCT and so I think it may be a useful addition to the research literature.

It would be useful clearly point out in the final version that it was only the lowest grp that differed from the two highest. However other research has shown a stronger linear trend with experience

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

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept without revision

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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