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**Reviewer's report:**

**General**
The authors have been very responsive to my comments and I will clarify the one area of concern raised by the authors in the section below.

**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 main point I made concerned the authors' reporting of 'step 5', which I think needs some clarification. What is this "consensus approach"? How was it reached? Which techniques are discarded and what thresholds are used? Are we sure that graded tasks influence self-efficacy alone or might they influence other variables?

**Discretionary Revisions** (which the author can choose to ignore)

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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