Dear Editor,

We want to thank you for your feedback regarding our QUBES lesson. We have revised the lesson and have made quite a few adjustments. The first adjustments were made in regards to the overall flow of the QUBES lesson. Edits were made so that readers would be able to better understand the purpose of the lesson and how the focal paper is being used.

Next, we made adjustments to the overall content of the lesson. Learning objectives were expanded to include more about what is expected in the lesson. We also changed the datasets that we were focusing on to the minimum spring and neap tide data. From this, further edits were made to the analysis to help with the flow of the lesson.

Edits were made to the section of the lesson that introduces the focal paper. We were able to better explain the parts of the focal paper that were important to our lesson thanks to the feedback received. We also looked further into the variable “water_elevation” in the dataset and found a passage from the paper that explains the increase.

There was feedback regarding the explanation of the ANCOVA section as reviewers found that it would be confusing for students. There was concern that students would not know how to read the summary table and would be left confused. To fix this, we inserted two paragraphs to explain what is in an ANCOVA summary and what each of the coefficients mean and why they are important in understanding the analysis.

Significant changes have been made to the R code as feedback requested we lead students more efficiently in the R part of the lesson. The first change was that we changed the second dataset to be the minimum spring data instead of maximum neap as we thought it would make more sense with the lesson plan. We went through and created easy to understand headers throughout the lesson so that students could follow along easier. We added more details to the beginning of the lesson by inserting information about the dataset and where it was acquired from. We also mentioned that we are closely following the code from the study in order to recreate the figures in order to give credit to the authors which was requested by reviewers. To add more detail to our R code we described the variables in the dataset being looked at so students will understand what they are seeing. Throughout the code we simply walk the students through the code more than our draft did so students understand what they are doing as they are doing it. We also included a conclusion and some citations that were needed in order to wrap it up.

Sincerely,
Holly Robison and Emma Powell