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Thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript #32029800. We sincerely appreciate the comments of the reviewers and have incorporated their suggestions as outlined in the chart below. We believe this manuscript will contribute to the *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reviewer | Section | Requested change | Change | Location in Document |
| A | Methodology | Explain how you recruited students Was participation open to all students in the two colleges? Or were there criteria for inclusion? If so, what were they? It would be helpful if you explain why recruitment was limited to these two particular colleges – business and Health and Human Sciences? For example, are the authors affiliated with these colleges? If so, do you think that this affiliation might have impacted the results? | An explanation is given that this was a convenience sample of selected courses within these two colleges. Although this was done, in part, because the researchers were affiliated with these colleges, it was unlikely to have affected the results given that four of the five coders were from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.  | Pages 3-4 |
| A | Methodology/Results | Regarding the claim, “Within these themes, inter-rater reliabilities on the coding of ten dimensions were within acceptable limits, ranging from .72 - .91.” Please support this statement with a citation noting this is an acceptable limit. | Citation added. | Page 6 |
| A | Results/ References | Two changes needed in references to adhere to APA style. | APA styles changes made. | Pages 8 and 19 |
| A | Coverage | It consolidates prior research though findings should be viewed in light of the study’s limitations; mainly no information is available on student participant demographics.  | As no student participant demographics, other than college, were collected, there are none to report. This is identified as a limitation. | Page 18 |
| B | Purpose | From the introduction to the research I am unclear after the reading exactly what the goal of the study was. Because of this, ‘I was unsure if the objectives matched the goals. From the research questions I hypothesized the goals. From the method section, I gathered that the students being asked for their input was the first objective. The research lacked a hypothesis. | The introduction was modified to quickly identify the purpose of the study (page 1), clearly delineate the goal and objectives of the study (page3) and explain why there was no preconceived hypothesis for the study (page 3). | Pages 1 and 3 |
| B | Methodology | This study can be difficult to apply to an entire population because there were a small number of student participants. Because the study looks at at-risk students, the pool of participants could have been larger. The research questions were good but the data could have been better assessed if the questions were not open ended.  | The number of student participants (80) was large for focus group research. The study was not intended to look at at-risk students. This language was removed from page 1.The questions were purposefully open-ended as this was a qualitative study looking for emergent themes. | Page 1 |
| B | Results | The findings were a bit wordy and hard to follow. I had to read it a few times to determine the results. Try condensing this section and making it easier to read and follow for someone looking to replicate the study. | Some of the material in the Results belonged in the Methodology section and was moved there.The Results section was edited to remove excessive “wordiness.” | Page 5Pages 5-15 |
| B | Discussion | The discussion was well executed. Here is where I found the reason for the study. It is great that the rationale was repeated in the discussion, but it also needs to be stated in the introduction. | The rationale is now stated in the introduction. | Page 3 |