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Reviewer’s report:

Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
Yes, although it is not exactly a new issue, as e-learning solutions have been extensively studied, the authors define the problem and the context in which the research was held very clearly.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
Yes, the methods are appropriate to assess the stated objectives, which were to measure the acquisition of specific skills.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
Yes, they seem to be.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes, the discussion and conclusion bring relevant issues, such as the concern with the ones who chose not to participate with pedagogical principles.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

7. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes.

Discretionary Revisions: none

Minor Essential Revisions: review punctuation, review the use of the word development in methods/abstract (Was the programme developed or only
evaluated?)

Major Compulsory Revisions: none