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Reviewer's report:

General

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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)

The authors have provided an interesting paper that's clearly written. They have addressed most of the comments raised in the review. Given the statements in the discussion, if possible, it would be useful for the authors to provide an example of how they'd suggest educators modify their teaching to incorporate the results found in this study. I think readers would find this useful - to be more explicit than teachers should match their material to the learner's profile - but would understand if the authors didn't feel comfortable making this more explicit for the reader.

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