**Reviewer A**

1. More in terms of recommendations, specifically for administrators and policy development
   * We have revised the section in the discussion on recommendations so that it is more relevant for school administrators.
2. Attached edits from file
   * Went through track changes for edits.

**Reviewer B**

1. Issues with in-text APA citation that needs fixing
   * We have gone through the manuscript and have fixed the APA citations.
2. Text should be copy-edited
   * We have copy-edited the paper.
3. Significance of the research question – “poor job at setting up the study; that is, writing the context and impetus for this work. We do not get a sense of the problem that needs to be addressed.”
   * We have added to the introduction (see track changes) in order to do a better job at setting up the significance of the study in terms of the problem that needs to be addressed.
4. “Research cited in Canada is very narrow. While the work cited is relevant, there needs a stronger connection to the Canadian literature, such as the works of Andre Grace, Robert Mizzi, Gerald Walton, Rinaldo Walcott, Wayne Martino, Didi Khayatt, Deborah Britzman, Sarah Pickett, Jen Gilbert, Alicia Lapointe, and so forth. The works repeatedly cited thus far does not give this reviewer the impression that the Canadian literature has been adequately reviewed.  In fact, the research cited in the US is more thorough, which is highly problematic given the theme of the journal and the theme of this particular journal article”.
   * We agree that all of these researchers have made important contributions to the literature, but these researchers are qualitative, and their research is not directly related to the topics reviewed. Our lit review focuses specifically on school climate, the need for intervention, teachers’ attitudes and connection to practices, religious affiliation. That said, we missed a few obvious ones, including Schneider & Dimito, 2008. As such, we have revised our literature review to include more contributions from Canadian authors.
5. Reference that “Alberta is putatively Canada’s most conservative province.”
   * We have cited the source and page number, and have removed the adjective “putatively”.
6. “Why use same-sex marriage as proxy? Why is same-sex marriage important, or connected to, the issues facing LGBTQ-inclusive education? Give a rationale for this approach. This seems rather narrow in scope.”
   * Our decision to use same-sex marriage as a proxy is similar to other research on LGBTQ-inclusive education. We have added these citations in the manuscript (see track changes). However, if you wish we could also include the following (however, we worry about adding to the length of the manuscript): “We wanted to investigate whether educators’ practices were influenced by their faith community’s position on LGBTQ issues. We selected same-sex marriage as a proxy for LGBTQ-related issues more generally because most faith communities have made official public statements on same-sex marriage, thus providing a common factor for use in our analysis, whereas only some have articulated positions on LGBTQ-inclusive education. Although same-sex marriage by no means encompasses all the factors involved in religious communities’ perspectives on LGBTQ-inclusive education (e.g., discourses of recruitment, parental rights, etc.), we hypothesized that a perspective on marriage equality would signal similar perspectives on other topics involving sexual and gender diversity including LGBTQ-inclusive education.”
7. “The researchers are correct that there are few studies that measure the influence of religious affiliation in intervening in homophobic incidents. Since the researchers are using the data from the Every Teacher Project, perhaps it is the analysis of the data that is novel, and not the data itself. This should be explicitly stated upfront. More information about the Every Teacher Project (including a reference) would be useful, and who is on the research team, and why the authors are using this data. The authors then should justify secondary analysis of the data as a valid approach. What was novel in this analysis that wasn’t already captured in the preliminary analysis put forth by Taylor et al?”
   * We have cited the Every Teacher project. It is hard to respond to this comment in the manuscript itself due to the fact that the peer-review process needs to be a blinded one. Since we are the authors of the Every Teacher project, it would be hard to write this without jeopardizing the review process. However, we did add a couple of sentences to the “Statistical analysis” section to illustrate how the current study differs from the Every Teacher final report (see track changes).
8. “What is needed for school administrators to see the value of professional development for anti-homophobia education? The evidence is clear through the data that this type of work is needed, but the authors needs to ground this work now in Ed Admin literature, and explain the disconnect between administrators and PD, or what barriers exist for PD to take place. Further, what does PD look like? Is it a matter of ad-hoc workshops or a continual program?”
   * I really think it’s beyond the scope of our findings to address the questions of barriers and type of PD required. However, we did reference Lugg and Murphy (2014) who do have things to say about these questions.
9. “The concluding remarks seem scant, and there is no follow up with the literature as to what is meaningful to educational administration (perhaps consult the works of Catherine Lugg, Michael O'Malley, Autumn Tooms for some ideas); further, the authors missed an opportunity to inform leadership (of the church, of the school) and alleviate some of their own concerns as purported in the literature”
   * Instead of introducing references to the concluding remarks, we have tried to include more citations of the suggested authors elsewhere that draws on this point. See review comment #8.