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Reviewer's report:

Reviewer 1 Comment 2 Not addressed  Authors responded as though this was related to the sham question where intent (which may not have been clear from phrasing) was to query as to why only a half year of compulsory evaluations was compared to a full year of voluntary evaluations. Did this introduce sampling bias?

P4L9 Minor change. "However, few studies…” Need to change to "However, a few studies…”

Appreciate the changes to the introduction and the clarity of the hypothesis.

P9 L17-20  I appreciate the attempt at clarity here but sentence phrasing is still quite awkward and needs refinement. I might suggest the following

This intervention was administered to a single cohort during the 2015-16 (compulsory response) academic year. This positioning was selected to occur after students were familiar with the compulsory process. We felt it was not appropriate to continue with this intervention as students may start to notice the sham question and alter their responses to the entire survey.

Simplifying Table 1 helps focus the reader on the key data elements. Much appreciated.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

Yes
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 recommend additional statistical review

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