|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **REVIEWER 1** |  |
| Clarification – is this a research study, literature review, or article? The abstract refers to the paper as an article, in the introduction the paper is presented as an exploration, on pg. 2, the authors state that they have written a “tripartite literature review” which led to confusion on page 6 when the paper is referenced as an analysis accompanied by a methodology. | Abstract changed: This article describes a document analysis of  References to paper changed to article  Explore when referring to this paper was replaced with document analysis (formerly p2 now p 1)  Tripartite literature review changed to report |
| Align the style of the paper (once you have clarified what kind of manuscript it is) following APA (6th edition) standards ie/ headings, use of tables | Level of headings verified  Formatting changes made to Tables.  One table converted to figure.  Table 4 reworked and appears as an appendix. |
| Re-write the abstract so it aligns with the rest of the transcript – it is unclear where the manuscript includes or demonstrates there has been “a positive turn toward greater inclusion of SSEN in FSL” | Sentence changed to:  In hopes of responding to the identified gaps and inconsistencies in actual application, this article concludes with recommendations to continue to enhance inclusion in FSL across Canada. |
| There are several places where as a reader I was confused – pg. 2, it states “from which this article originates” is this referring to the text submitted or something else?, pg. 13 – “some provinces provide information and support on inclusive programming in FSL information in other formats” - such as? | P2 clarified: the tripartite report that served as impetus for this article  p. 13 clarified : some provinces provide information and support on inclusive programming in FSL information in accompanying documents such as documents created for school administration (e.g., Manitoba Education, 2007). |
| Use of more supporting work – for instance on pg. 4 it states “students may transfer out of French immersion programs for reasons other than academic difficulties” the reader is left wondering what those other reasons are | Added parentheses and additional reference (e.g., frustration, discomfort speaking French) Bruck 1985 |
| Identify the names of the documents being reviewed in the text ie/ pg. 13 – “we searched these subject-specific documents” the reader wonders, what documents exactly? | Changed to we searched the FSL curriculum documents for instructional strategies to address the needs of SSEN |
| Table 4 is long and confusing – needs to be re-worked – this could be cleaned up and added as an appendix | Table 4 simplified and now appears as an appendix. |
| Overall the flow/congruence of the article needs to be re-developed – the addition of headings, more paragraphs, improved sentence structure, and organization could help | Five subheadings added |
| **REVIEWER 2** |  |
| p. 19 Only four provinces listed below | Added Manitoba |
| I suggest that the abstract note that some recommendations for continued development are made – it might help to keep some readers engaged. | Added: including applying equity of access to optional programs |
| It does with one possible exception. There are a couple of citations listed as “author” or “author 2”. These might have been listed this way for the sake of anonymity in the review copy, although that was not necessary in my case. However, I think the APA style is to simply cite authors by their names, just as with any other author. | We have now unblinded the manuscript so author 2 is referred to by name |
| **REVIEWER 3** |  |
| There are a few minor typos in the manuscript and I have noted these using track changes to the attached document. The author(s) also rely on the use of the third person and anthropomorphization (neither of which are promoted in APA 6, but I am not sure what the practice of the CJEAP is). | Accepted minor corrections as per track changes |
| Comments:  Wilms took issue with his own report? | Reworded sentence to clarify:  While Dicks (2008) took issue with both Willms’ report and a report commissioned by New Brunswick’s Department of Education (Croll & Lee, 2008), he acknowledged that there was streaming in early French immersion, |
| I think that the authors should clarify what they mean by the terms 'inclusion' and 'students with special educational needs.'  these are both commonly used terms that are often used in different ways. | Added 2 footnotes |
| I would encourage the author(s) to use a few more sub-headings to highlight their substantive points throughout the article (within the Findings, Discussion and Rationale sections). | 5 subheadings added |
| I might encourage the authors to highlight that this article is a review of current Canadian educational policy and does not touch upon actual practice. | Added clause on p 7  nor can the findings be extended to be representative of practice |
| An interesting area of further study would be to look at the various accountability measures that are used in provinces and territories to ensure what the outcomes are for students. | One clause added to conclusion  and offer means by which to measure their progress |

Please note: we also made corrections to reference list