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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has substantially been improved, more clear message has been put in better context discussion is more focussed. I miss the discussion on not to include the T0 measurement and its potential effects on the results there are some minor typo's that need to be corrected

For understanding the statistic analysis, I would suggest the authors better explain how they did perform the logistic regression. what was the outcome (knowledge on T1?), but how did they then compare outcome at T2 (difference between T1 and T2 or was T1 included as a variable in the model to estimate T2?

Next, I advice the editor to judge the need for external statistical evaluation, given the discrepancy between both reviewers and the opinion of the authors.

line 13-17 page 11: discrepancies are an artefact of the data: this should be: given that the groups are randomised, it does not affect the result/conclusions of our study. however, it may affect generalizability of the results. in that sense, testing for associations between baseline characteristics of the groups on the effect (or correct for it) may be helpful
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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