We have made the following changes to the submission, based on the reviewers’ feedback:

* We have significantly reorganized the paper’s introduction and literature review to foreground the purpose of the study: examining rates of representation for underrepresented groups in Ontario teacher education. As Reviewer B suggested, we have explicitly identified what we mean by equitable representation and how that relates to teacher diversity. We have shifted the “Purpose” section to earlier in the article, so that the context that follows is clearer to the reader.
* We have reworded and reordered the literature review as suggested by Reviewer B. We believe these sections are necessary for the manuscript, as we agree with Reviewer A that this review frames the study’s place in the broader literature.
* We have clarified the relationship between equity and quality – in particular, that while student quality is important, quality does not have the come at the expense of equity.
* We have moved the definitions of the included underrepresented groups to earlier in the paper (as suggested by Reviewer B), and clarified that these broad categories are those being used by Ontario’s teacher education programs. We agree with Reviewers B and C that these are imperfect labels, and so have added a section addressing this limitation, as well as other key limitations to the data.
* We have reworded the section that describes how low rates of representation need to be examined so that its relationship to the study’s overall purpose is clearer.
* We have removed the paragraph on labour market benefits to focus on the primary goal of the paper. While the paragraph furthers the importance of equitable admissions, we agree with Reviewer B that it is outside the main thrust of the article.
* We have expanded the introduction to the Methods section to clarify our use of descriptive statistics, as requested by Reviewer B.
* We have clarified the sentence at the beginning of paragraph 3 in the Students with Disabilities section to better reflect our intended meaning.
* We have removed the phrase “Consistent with anecdotal comments from our colleagues” from page 32 (formerly 18), as the comment from Reviewer B suggests the source of the subsequent claim was unclear. As the data in Table 4 shows, York’s rate of representation for this group has indeed decreased, at least within the data available to York (and us) at this time. While our colleagues at York did suspect that their program was less diverse, their concern is additional, not the cause of the data listed in Table 4.
	+ To speak to Reviewer B’s underlying question – how much can our colleagues’ data be trusted – as we note in the added Limitations section, we assume that our colleagues, in their capacities as Deans, Registrars, and Program Managers, have reported their data honestly and within the context of the information that they have available. We are not aware of a more reliable source for the questions at hand. While there are ways to improve the validity of such data, these improvements first require individual institutions to reflect on their own successes and challenges. This is a particular aim of the present study, as we do not believe such improvements will happen without contextual knowledge about current rates of representation and the gaps that they present.
* We have reworded the recommendations section to more clearly situate the recommendations within the context of the present study, along with the broader context of current research in teacher education admissions.
* We have unblinded the article to make references to the related studies clearer.
* We have made a series of APA corrections, as suggested by Reviewer C.

Taken together, we believe that these corrections reflect the suggestions of all 3 reviewers, particularly by clarifying the scope and purpose of the study, and by more clearly presenting how the data presented contribute to the ongoing research in this area.