Dear Alan,

Jim and I have made the suggested revisions to the manuscript. A table of comments/suggestions and revisions has been provided below to aid your review of the revised manuscript. The page and line numbers are exact because we have deleted the reviewers’ queries and comments. Thus, this table should help to guide you as you conduct your review.

Thank you for your time and help with this manuscript, we appreciate that very much.

Sincerely,

Ray and Jim

98-532-3 RV (Reviewers Comments)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Revised Page/Line | Reviewers’ Comments/Suggestions | Revision/Response  |
| 5, line 4 | afterword | Revised to “afterward.” |
| 6, line 21 | Be careful with overuse of acronyms; this one doesn’t seem to be necessary.  | We deleted the acronym. |
| 7, lines 2-5 | Confusing; suggest rewording.  | Revised to say, “Shulman (2005) suggested signature pedagogies were disciplinary approaches such as cases in law or rounds in medicine, which were then directly applicable in professional practice. In the current context, action research, LSCs, and so on used in doctoral programs were appropriate for use in workplace situations after doctoral study.” |
| 7, line 8 | Much clearer than acronym. | This was a comment. No revision was necessary.  |
| 9, lines 8-11 | This section is awkward and confusing consider adjusting tense. A table/chart to describe the process would be helpful. | We have revised the text to say, “Second, at [name deleted for review], LSCs usually have met every other week for about three months to support students’ initial efforts, then once a month for the last two months of the first semester of their second year. During these last two months, students also met individually with their LSC chairs to advance their work.” We believe this clarifies the matter and chose not to insert a table for this minor part of the description of LSCs.  |
| 9, line 22 | An earlier section that describes the program format would be helpful.  | We chose not to add any more material that would be “too program specific,” which might make it more difficult for readers to consider use of LSCs in their contexts.  |
| 10, line 3  | f-2-f? virtually? | We added information to indicate the “learning associates often scheduled face-to-face and in a few instances virtual writing sessions …. |
| 11, line 711, line 9 | How does the IRB process fit into this process? Is IRB approval generally a smooth process in a reasonable period of time?  | We added, “and (d) IRB processes” to line 7 and we added, “IRB materials,” to line 9.  |
| 11, line 15 | brief’ was identified as a typo.  | We deleted the apostrophe to make it say, “brief” |
| 12, line 15 | Not parallel construction | We revised to make it parallel. It now reads, “and from committee members.”  |
| 12, lines 16-17 | Not sure who “we” are? Participating supervising professors? | We rewrote this to say, “In Table 1, details have been provided about the sequencing of the tasks …” |
| 15, line 5 | How many? One or both institutions? | We provided more detail by stating, “We asked recent graduates at [name deleted for review (one of the institutions)] about their perceptions ….. |
| 17, line 13-14 | Are these the only two concentration choices? At both institutions?] | We revised this to clarify it. We inserted a sentence that says, “At both institutions, students came from a wide range of professions including PK-12, higher education, non-profit organizations, nursing, and so on.”  |
| 17, line 19 | Suggested, inserted text was “that these” | We accepted this suggestion. The text now reads, “Taken together, it is clear that these graduates … |
| 19, line 2 | Is it possible that heterogeneous groups might also be useful?  | Consistent with the comment, we added the following sentence, “By comparison, would heterogeneous LSCs be useful?”  |
| 19, lines 7-13 | The manuscript seem to end rather abruptly; further development including recommendations for research would be helpful.  | We have recast the Conclusion section to include considerations for research *and* practice. The beginning of the section now says, “In the conclusion, we consider two important matters. The first deals with research about LSCs. The second matter is concerned with using LSCs in practice. With respect to research, several aspects of LSCs warrant additional inquiry. For example, what are the effects of heterogeneous as compared to homogeneous grouping by background (PK-12 vs. higher education vs. other)? Can enhanced outcomes be attained when students are grouped into LSCs based on the same or similar topic(s)? In another line of inquiry, researchers might consider further, what are the benefits of LSCs?”  |
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