Dear Editors,

I would like to sincerely thank you for the opportunity to submit this paper to CALICO and for the valuable comments and suggestions provided by four reviewers.

I have made all requested revisions to the manuscript based on the reviewers’ comments, which I hope will render this paper publishable.

The ways in which I attended to the comments/recommendations are detailed below.

I feel that the manuscript is much stronger as a result of these revisions and I look forward to hearing the editors’ final decision.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SUGGESTIONS | ACTION TAKEN |
| COMMENTS BY MULTIPLE REVIEWERS | |
| Literature review | |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | Three out of four reviewers suggested re-drafting literature review to make it:  More *relevant*  More focused  Specifically, Reviewer 1 recommended “tightening up literature review”  Reviewer 2 commented that “there should be studies that examine dual modalities in other situations. These might make the paper a richer examination of the phenomenon”.  Reviewer 4 recommended “narrowing the focus of the paper and including a more thorough review of relevant literature”. | Introduction and literature review have been re-written following the recommendations of the reviewers.  Unlike the previous introduction that was more general, the ‘new’ introduction is focused specifically on the investigation of pedagogical effects of dual modalities.  Further, literature review has been extended to include studies investigating the effect of typing on interactions in a face-to-face context, as well as learners’ preferences for multimodal design of instructional programs.  These changes make the introduction more focused and relevant. | | |
| Presentation of statistical results | |
| Two reviewers (Reviewer 1 and Reviewer 2) commented on the presentation and explanations of statistical results on pages 24-26. They recommended discussing the results in more detail. | Following reviewers’ recommendations, the presentation and explanations of statistical results has been extended. The re-written presentation of statistical results can be found on pages 24-25. |
| COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUAL REVIEWERS | |
| REVIEWER A | |
| Reviewer 1 recommended extending the discussion of the students’ monosyllabic repetitions considering other reasons such as stalling for time while teacher  is typing; divided attention between reading and speaking; "to/and" usually  indicate the beginning of a new chunk or phrase so it might be more logical  to repeat those; etc. | Following the reviewer’s recommendation, a new paragraph was added after Excerpt 7 (p.28) to include alternative explanations, such as divided attention between speaking/typing, stalling for time, etc. |
| REVIEWER B  GENERAL COMMENTS | |
| Reviewer 2 noted “Would the use of classroom written (white board or blackboard) be a fair comparison to this?” | Reviewer 2’s point is excellent. In fact, the use of whiteboard/blackboards in a face-to-face classroom was the *first* area of literature reviewer that was conducted for this paper. It was surprising and disappointing to find out that there is a dearth of studies on the use of black/white boards in classrooms.  Most publishes studies seem to be either on (i) the ‘chalk talk’ (the use of black/white board) while teaching mathematics, science, etc. These studies focus on how mathematical narratives (formulas) are written on the board and how it constitutes a central genre of many lectures ([for example Artemeva & Fox, 2011](#_ENREF_1)) or (ii) on the use of interactive whiteboards in the classroom ([for example Schmid, 2006](#_ENREF_2)).  While the studies above (and related studies) are of interest, they don’t seem to be directly relevant for this study. Thus their inclusion would contradict the aim to present a focused literature review relevant to the context of this investigation.  In order to pre-empt other readers’ questions about literature on the use of white/blackboard, a brief summary of the existing research has been added to page 4. |
| REVIEWER B  RECOMMENDED CHANGES | |
| Reviewer 2 recommended a number of grammatical/lexical changes.  Comment (l) the annotation convention should be presented before the transcript containing it. | Comments a-k are no longer relevant as the Introduction/literature reviewer have been re-written and the new parts do not include these sentences.  Following Reviewer 2’s suggestion the annotation conventions have been moved. They are now located on Page 10-11 (prior to the presentation of transcripts). |
| REVIEWER B  COMMENTS | |
| 1. Page 4, line 17:  what is the basis for making this statement about teacher support | This sentence is no longer a part of Introduction/Literature review. |
| 1. Page 6, line 9: It can be, but a single participant in a study is not be   sufficient to convey that. Certainly stronger evidence of the conclusion  unless the authors are reporting someone else’s results is warranted. | This sentence has been modified following the reviewer’s recommendation. |
| 1. Page 7, line 18:  Why are the authors projecting hypotheses and then stating that it is not possible to do so? | Excellent point from Reviewer 2. The paragraph has been rewritten to make it more logical (see page 7-8). The point about not being able to hypothesize is now omitted and several hypothesis are presented based on the literature review. This is consistent with the suggestion made by Reviewer 4 who suggested formulating hypothesis based on literature. |
| 1. Page 10, line 8:  Are there inter-annotator agreement measures before reconciliation of annotations? | The coding and analysis for this paper was conducted by *one* researcher. Unfortunately, inviting another researcher to do inter-annotator agreement was impractical and against the Ethics Approval for the Data Access for this study. Even though there are 3 people who are authorized to have access to the data, only one of these researchers (author of this paper) is a Russian speaker. There is considerable amount of Russian in the transcripts and the coding/annotations requires the knowledge of Russian. |
| 1. Page 10, line 13:  This sentence is confusing | The sentence has been re-written. |
| 1. Page 18, line 13:  Is it true that no students employed text chat or no students initiated text chat? | The point has been clarified. |
| 1. Page 20, line 7:  Is this a warranted conclusion?  Realizing that it is an empirical study and no interviews were conducted, it seems as if there could be multiple interpretations. | Following Reviewer 2’s comment, the conclusion has been removed and re-phrased to suggest further research on teachers’ pedagogical preferences. |
| 1. Page 24, table 10:  this is a confusing table. | This modification has been discussed earlier. Following two reviewers’ recommendations the explanations for the statistical results have been extended (see 23-24). |
| 1. Page 34, line 24: Are there non-pedagogical studies that can answer this question? | Following Reviewer 2’s suggestion, I added the reference to studies in other domains that can potentially enrich our understanding of this phenomenon (see page 34). |
| REVIEWER C | |
| Reviewer 3 made a number of recommendations about the labeling of this paper. Specifically, Reviewer 3 suggested:  In the methodology section, the subheading "data" is confusing, and thus can be omitted.  Another label of subheading is "results" that should be omitted.  The contents in these sections are mixed, and hence, are confusing. Therefore, the "data" label should be deleted.  The label "summary of results" is also unnecessary.  The term "summary' can be deleted but the idea of summary can embedded  in a paragraph at the end of that section. | All of Reviewer 3’s recommendations have been followed.  The label ‘Data’ has been removed.  Label ‘Results’ has been omitted.  The label ‘Data’ has been removed.  The label ‘Summary of results’ has been removed.  Following Reviewer’s suggestion the idea of the summary is embedded in the final paragraph of this section (see page 7). |
| REVIEWER D | |
| GENERAL COMMENTS | |
| I think the goals of this paper are too broad to be meaningful. I get the sense that this paper has been carved out of a larger study that goes far more into depth on each of the topics. If that is the case, I would recommend rewriting this paper to focus more narrowly on one or two areas. | Following the Reviewer’s recommendation, the focus of the paper has been made more focused (pedagogical uses of text chat).  The Reviewer’s impression that this study constitutes a part of a larger investigation is accurate. However, the focus of related studies was considerably different (e.g. the genre of lessons or students’ expectations of their future private tutors). This paper presents all the analysis relevant to the interplay between written and spoken channels. |
| I found it odd that one of the advantages you claim of your data is that it is longitudinal, yet this paper does not appear to address any development of practices over time. If you did any kind of longitudinal analysis, this would be more meaningful for the research community than the findings in this paper. | There appears to be a misunderstanding in regards to the nature of data (which has been clarified in the paper). This study is not a longitudinal one. The analysis is based on one class only of each dyad. The advantage discussed in the paper refers to the data being obtained from long-term dyads, who are (presumably) not affected by the novelty factor commonly criticized in the literature. In other words, while the dyads are long-term and have been studying for a while, the data used in this study is from one class per dyad and thus does not lend itself to a longitudinal analysis. This point has been clarified in the paper. |
| There is a fair amount of research on SCMC of various types to allow you to formulate hypotheses about, for example, what feedback and uptake might look like in this bimodal online teaching environment.  This would allow you to provide a more meaningful literature review and a richer discussion of how teachers provided the feedback (perhaps over time) and how learners’ used it or didn’t (again, perhaps over time). | Following Reviewer 4’s recommendation literature review has been extended and made more focused. There is more focused discussion of pedagogical uses of text chat and hypothesizing of how teachers in this context might use text chat to provide feedback in this environment. |
| A specific example of where more depth of analysis would be important is p. 18, L19-23. Here you comment on one teacher’s much greater use of text messages during a 30 minute period. You don’t offer an explanation as to why this might be, yet this is potentially interesting from a research perspective. Here we need more info about that instructor-student dyad. Is the student more advanced than others, which then allows for more conversation and thus more opportunities for messaging? Does this instructor just talk more/faster than others? Was there any difference between uptake of the messages from this pair and that of others? | Following Reviewer 4’s recommendation a more detailed discussion of potential reasons for the increased use of text chat by one teacher has been added to page 18-19. |
| I also wished that you had offered more information on your subjects and the context. You do not provide us with any information on, for example, how long the teachers have been teaching, how much experience the students have with these lessons, what their proficiency level is, etc. I also don’t recall seeing how long each session was. You mention on page 18 that at least some sessions were 30 minutes, but your Figure 3 indicates that sessions could be “over 30 minutes”. Were all the sessions the same length? All of these factors can impact their language habits within this virtual environment. | Following Reviewer 4’s recommendation, more detailed information about the participants has been added. Specifically, Table 1 now provided information on dyad history (how long dyads have been having lessons); students’ proficiency level; lesson number, dyad demographic details and age of the participants. |
| REVIEWER D’S  RECOMMENDED CHANGES | |
| Literature review- narrow focus of paper and include a more thorough review of the relevant literature. The paucity of studies on the use of chat in multimodal SCMC doesn't justify a lack of depth of focus on, for example, feedback and uptake. There has been enough research on this topic on SCMC that you could present to set up a working hypotheses that could be explored in your data. | As discussed earlier, introduction and literature review of this paper has been re-written to make the focus of the paper narrower and tigher. |
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