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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions

I note that the author has addressed all of my comments. However, I would like the author to explain in a footnote the following:

1. the rationale for using a score of 65% as the cut off point for mid/high achievers. The reader will not know this and should be given this information in order to understand why this cut off point was selected.

2. I am still not convinced about your combination of deep and strategic approaches. However, I accept your argument about why this has been done. However, I am going to suggest that you provide a footnote explaining your rationale for combining these two approaches to the reader.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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