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I guess the authors additional work on the manuscript improved the quality of the paper. However, there are still some aspects missing.

Introduction:

The different theoretical DT models as reported by Lacour et al and Wollesen et al are still not discussed. However, this is necessary to understand the anticipated effects of the own DT-setting (arithmetic).

The included reference by Wollesen & Voelcker-Rehage did not refer the models- it focused on DT training ?!

The following questions are still open- the answer to this question is not satisfying…. 

Did you perform a sample size calculation? You are performing a range of tests, how did you define statistical significance?

Discussion

I still do not agree with the conclusion on page 11 line 26-28. As the different DT models were not discussed sufficiently, the interpretation due to the model by Yogev-Seligman is vague. Moreover, the conclusion on page 13 line 1-3 about the resource allocation is a suggestion. As you did not measure resource allocation you can only suppose that there might be an association. I would agree if you argue that there might be influences of personality, however, this really needs further investigation.

I would recommend discuss the models, the own cognitive DT and to interpret the results more carefully concerning the DT models and the missing sample size calculation.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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