**Here is a list of the reviewers’ recommendations**

**with our actions against each one (in red):**

1. Revise title - you don't really discuss the interplay between reading and writing

New title: Supporting the Neophyte Writer: The Importance of Scaffolding the Process

1. Add to the discussion of extraneous vs. germane loads a more specific example of each (I didn’t understand the “self-explanation” example for germane loads

To address the point made by the reviewer the section headed Cognitive Load has been re-written. Please see pages 2 and 3.

1. mention another reason that PowerPoint makes good sense as a scaffolding strategy for neophyte academic writers: many articles start off as conference presentations composed using PowerPoint so it requires less effort to transform a presentation that’s already in this particular software into an article than it would to have writers move to a new software such as Google docs, which would increase cognitive load

This message has been inserted into the Introduction

1. make more explicit the connection between how PowerPoint helped increase the novice writer’s intrinsic motivation

Done in Motivation section

1. use “we” instead of “they” when referring to your own writing process

Done throughout

1. replace, “It is likely that . . .” with “Our study will show that . ..” or “Our findings suggest . . .” since what followed “It is likely that . . .” seemed like an unproven claim

Done

1. add apostrophe: (pg. 4, 1st paragraph: “The first is task structure, which the authors argue guides the learner during the planning and performance components of the task, while the second benefit, which is referred to as ‘content problematizing’, is associated with the mechanisms that facilitate a learners [NEEDS AN APOSTROPHE AFTER ‘R’] understanding of the task in relation to the content)

Edited

1. rewrite: p. 5 “They also revisited the PowerPoint scaffolding to revise the main points that had previously been identified they and to continue with the structure and contents of their article.

Done

1. Edit: last sentence: “Scaffolding had the effect of allowing a less experienced [DELETE “S” IN WRITER] writers to reduce his cognitive load on working memory by providing a place to store information, which allowed time for a publication writing schema to develop.”

Done

1. Explain further and add example: ‘A schema is a general term that relates to memory structures which are initially processed through thinking and learning in working memory before being stored as long-term memories’

Further explanation is provided and examples have been included. Please see page 2

1. Explain more about: ‘germane load’ and the fact that this should be encouraged

This is addressed in point 2 above

1. Has a new schema been developed by the novice writer? Explain – e.g. What did this writer actually derive from this current intervention that he could carry into his future attemtps at publication?  (give key features in brackets where mention is made that the novice writer developed a new writing schema)

Edited

1. Add a clear purpose statement to the intro from the abstract, (aim to look at support structures for novice academic writers / analyse the causes of the difficulties in writing for novice writers – i.e. what will this article do?)

Done

1. Remove capitals from Self-Determination / theories

All relevant capitals removed on page 3

1. maintain a list of nouns by changing to know with ‘knowledge’ or ‘knowing’? (‘to know, accomplishment, stimulation’)

Done

1. edit: ‘than as continuous unit’ -  than as a continuous unit

‘a’ added in on page 2

1. edit to singular not plural: ‘Writers, have the most difficulty’ (change to has)

have has been changed to ‘has’ on page 1

1. put a double dash around the additional information, rather  than a dash and comma. The greatest (rather than most?) difficulty, perhaps?

Edited with commas not a dash

1. Change in to a well-constructed – into (one word)

‘in to’ has been changed to ‘into’ on page 1

1. Edit: A system involved (…)  – don’t you mean ‘the system (…) is working memory’? or ‘a system (…) is working memory’.  (I think I found this a rather bizarre sentence because of the use of the word ‘called’.  I think the term working memory is pretty common)
2. Check use of apostrophe throughout (students interest in the - a student's or students' / a learners understanding - a learner's understanding / the co-authors motivation levels had increased)

Done

1. Edit: computer driven - computer-driven

computer-driven added in on page 4

1. Add evidence for claims:  As writing for a peer-reviewed journal poses special demands, the transfer of learning is usually low, which can lead to frustration for anyone new to the publication writing process, and this can eventually result in drop out.

Done

1. Be specific here: As an initial exploration of the issues which affect neophyte writers, this paper has sought to contribute to debate about how to develop writing (eg 'writing support for academic tutors ')

Done

1. Edit: ‘By arguing for the inclusion of scaffolding in to the’ – into (ie one word) or perhaps within or just ‘in’)?

‘Within’ added on page 6

1. Edit: ‘enjoyment of writing, Unless writing support for neophytes’   - include a full stop

Comma replaced by full stop on page 6

1. Edit to use may/might: ‘it can be a simple, effective, and low-cost method of boosting writers’ productivity, confidence levels, and success rates’

‘can’ has been replaced by ‘might’ on page 6

1. Edit: ‘investigated the use of a scaffolding mechanism in to’ - in will suffice here

The ‘ to’ has been deleted on page 7

1. Edit: a less experienced writers to - omit ‘s’ in writers

The ‘s’ has been omitted on page 7

1. Check references and citations: Some have a comma after the surname, others do not: (Murray, 2009).  (Haas 2011). (Deci & Ryan’s 2000). Omit:   's

The comma’s with brackets and the ‘s have been removed throughout the document

1. Add page no.: ‘with their model 15 of 21 submissions were accepted for publication’

p.13 added on page 1 of the manuscript

1. Edit: Amadieu, F., Van Gog, T., Paas, F., Tricot, A. and Marine´, C. (2009) or Baldwin, B. C. and Chandler, G. E. (2002)  - with or without the stop after initials?

Only full stops have been included after the initials in the Reference section. For example, Amadieu, F., Van Gog, T., Paas, F., Tricot, A. and Marine´, C. (2009) is now Amadieu, F. Van Gog, T. Paas, F. Tricot, A. and Marine´, C. (2009)

1. Edit: Schmdt – incorrect spelling

Schmidt added on page 7