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Dear Authors

I really appreciated the improvements in your manuscript which is interesting and useful both for students and teachers. I have the following suggestions.

a. In the abstract, there is a need to revise the findings and to report the main data emerged more precisely. Moreover, some symbols (p 0/05) needs to be revised according to the journal guidelines.

b. In the background, some terms are not appropriate: it is the case of the sentence 'Researchers believe..' I suggest to revise some sentences and also to revise the place where the references numbers have been positioned (very close to the last word of the sentence, by not leaving a space).

c. Also in the background, there are some words tracked (see line 44, 46) thus suggesting some inaccuracies; there is also a need to insert some spaces between the paragraph aimed at accompanying the readers to better understand the flow of the scientific reasoning.

d. Furthermore, in the background it is required to summarise the previous evidence in the field; in its actual form the manuscript reports the theories supporting the intervention designed and tested but not the evidence already available in the field.

e. As the last comment regarding the background, you have defined the problem solving later adopted as 'cognitive approaches'. The concept of cognitive approaches has not been explained.

f. Among the methods, the concept of 'is a two-group interfering study' should be better explained.

g. In the sampling method, there is a need to justify better the sampling and the allocation; the score is not supported by a specific reference and the tool used is not named. Therefore, I
strongly suggest to improve this section. In the following regarding the instrument, more details should be reported by referencing the instrument and by removing tracked words; the section highlighted in green seems to be just included in the section and not appropriately harmonised. In the procedure, some data regarding the sampling method have been reported. In this line, I strongly suggest to revise the entire section by harmonizing the parts and by explaining in each appropriate section the contents.

h. In the data analysis section, the inferential statistic has not been introduced, while later it has been used.

i. Among the finding the characteristic of participants have not been fully described; moreover, data should be reported in this section and then completed in the tables. In the actual form the data are only described and not reported; some symbols are not consistent with the journal rules.

j. The limitation section - which contains some errors - should be enriched.

The study remains interesting but its presentation in its actual form requires further development.

Moreover, I suggest to include the letter of the reviewers and an appropriate answer to each point in further submissions. In this manner reviewers can check the improvements introduced.
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