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| Reviewer Feedback | Revisions/Comments |
| Reviewer #1   1. Comment A1 Long paragraph 2. Comment A2 pseudonym 3. Comment A3 Cite examples of student experiences 4. A4 Common Core 5. Comment A5 on teacher effectiveness 6. A6: who is developing capacities? 7. A7: Convoluted sentence 8. A8: include citation on procedural engagement 9. Comment #a9 (awkward sentence) 10. A10: Who was included in this study? 11. A11: avoid second person 12. A12 13. A13 14. A14: programs can’t think 15. A15 change white 16. A16 what is STEM 17. A17 More likely than what? 18. A18 19. A19 20. A20 what do you mean? 21. A21 Move figure 22. A22 What is MAT? 23. A23 confused about 22 elements 24. A24 Convoluted sentence 25. A25 incorrect punctuation 26. A26 Culturally responsive literature | 1. For stylistic reasons as well as framing the case study, we wanted an uninterrupted paragraph 2. Put in asterisk 3. Gave example of student experiences in first paragraph 4. Added CCSS 5. Inserted citation of the MET Project 6. Changed to show that it is relevant for all students and that it is through educators. 7. Fixed! 8. Included citation 9. Fixed sentence in second paragraph 10. Cited the experience levels of teachers in study 11. Done! 12. Clarified Danielson frameworks and how it tied to article/engagement 13. Tried to make the connection clear between framework and furthering student engagement 14. Reworded the sentence 15. White 16. A16 wrote out STEM 17. Included a clarifying sentence 18. Fixed punctuation 19. Clarified the learners 20. Student teach 21. Moved! 22. Removed reference to MAT 23. Included reference to Danielson’s model earlier and removed reference to 22 elements—not essential in article. 24. Fixed sentence 25. Looks correct 26. Deleted cultural comment |
| Reviewer #2   1. Demographics 2. Definition of student engagement 3. Methodology 4. Methodology 5. Methodology | 1. Clarified the diversity of the students and demographics in the section on program structure pg? 2. We used Danielson’s Framework to define what engagement looks like. 3. Made sure to tighten our language in order to not confuse this article on a **promising practice** with research study. (in the article abstract)   Also removed the questions from the first section so that it would target that this is a promising practice not a research study. (also addresses 4 and 5)  We are very appreciative of the guiding comments and suggestions. Our article was focused on a promising practice. We removed “future research” in response to the reviewer’s comments as it would not be appropriate. |