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| **Reviewer’ comments** | **Responses** |
| I've just finished re-reading the article and I think this is vastly improved. | 😊 |
| I noted a few very minor APA issues. | * **References:** * For consistency, we have used the ampersand symbol (&) instead of “and” (4 changes have been made):   Locke **&** Latham, 1990: 2002: 2006 Nolan **&** Hoover, 2008 Brassard, Lusignan **&** Pelletier, 2013 Miles **&** Huberman, 1994   * We have double checked all the titles of references and the headings (capitalization) and we have made the necessary changes. * The heading of Table 2 does not use bold types anymore (page 20). * Headings at Level 2: “Data Analysis and Reliability” (bold types, not in italics). * We avoided writing single-sentence paragraphs (page 8):   “Supervision takes place in the spirit of assistance, discussion, recognition, and professional development, as well as in a climate of trust (Zepeda, 2007).” →   “Supervision takes place in the spirit of assistance, discussion, recognition, and professional development. A climate of trust between the teachers and the principal is also essential to facilitate supervision (Zepeda, 2007).” |
| Substantively my only suggestion is for the authors to add a couple of sentences **in their conclusion** regarding how their emergent theme (which is the original contribution of this study) might be used to think about teacher supervision differently. | A new paragraph and a new question (as a new avenue for future research) have been added:   * “Regarding accountability, our participants pointed out potential ethical risks, such as supervision focusing exclusively on basic knowledge and government-sanctioned core subjects. For pedagogical supervision to meet ethical standards, certain conditions must be met: (a) that the work follow an established plan and timeline; (b) that the teachers being supervised use the same evaluation methods; and (c) that the principal’s supervisory responsibilities (and associated accountability) be shared with other levels, such as school district heads, the school-team, the Ministry of Education, and universities in the area of initial training and continued professional development. These ethical considerations will enable stakeholders to view pedagogical supervision in a new light, with greater transparency and diligence.” (page 25) * “[…] And ultimately, how can they find a balance between the importance of results, associated with RBM, and the respect of ethical guidelines in pedagogical supervision?” (page 26) |
| The authors now provide a good overview of their conceptual framework, perhaps they could use their emergent theme to have readers rethink this element of the framework. | * This sentence has been added:   “Indeed, theoretically speaking, the cross-curricular competency of ethics may also be beneficially applied to the model of Locke and Latham as well as to other teacher supervision methodologies (Bouchamma, Giguère & April, 2017; Bouchamma & Brie 2014), particularly involving duties related to the setting and assessment of performance objectives.” (page 25) |
| I think these changes are relatively minor and very easy to address. Once they are attended to, I recommend publishing the paper. | 😊😊 |