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"REVISION ASSESSMENT FROM THE ACADEMIC PEER REVIEWER:

Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? Yes

Reviewer comments: The general structure of the manuscript is now more robust from a methodological point of view.

I still have a problem in understanding the scoring system: were there ""correct"" answers to be selected by the student? For example, Question 1 has these 8 possible answers:

• dirty symbiosis health harmful benefical infection disease mall

Bacteria can be either harmful (Salmonella typhii) or beneficial (enteric flora) and the suggested words seem to be more images to be associated to the concept of bacteria than ""right"" or ""wrong"" answers.

In Fig. 3 Q1 has an average score of 3.33 +/- 1.58 (by the way: what does Distribution of score 2.533 mean? Range between Min and Max score? ).

Maybe you meant that the more words the students selected, the better the test was? Or the more ""correct"" words they selected, the better? And if so, how many correct choices were there for any question?

So the increase in Q1 was from 3.33 to 3.47 (actually a slight increase...) Am I correct?"
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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