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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revision

Page 14, lines 15-17: The authors have done a good job earlier in the manuscript acknowledging that three may not always be the magic number of options. It would be nice if this continued in the Conclusions. I would suggest rewriting this sentence to read "Because the majority of items developed by teachers will not have more than two functioning distractors, including more distractors may not be a good investment of a teacher’s time in item development.''
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