Dear Dr Rachel George and reviewers,

We are grateful for the feedback from the reviewers, and have addressed the comments and attempted to review and enhance the paper as stated below. We have included new versions of the document (labelled and dated 6th July), one of which has names redacted and one which is not, and have submitted them through your online system.  
  
Reviewer feedback:  
  
This is an interesting and relevant article which highlights the current need for online technology and the need for checking how appropriate and useful these technologies are for both students and staff. The small, scale qualitative study provides an example for future low-cost focus-group based research in education.  
  
The article is relevant and would be of interest as the current e-learning situation has led us to re-think our methods of teaching. I found the link between digital tools and pedagogy a valid point, as we need to further explore the feedback on specific educational technologies. Also, I like the examples of recent ‘tools’

>>>We are very grateful to the reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions.  
  
Please address the following  
1) the reviewers felt that there are some confusing/misused statistics and data which either should be commented on further or removed. Although you provide reasons for the choice of the low numbers of participants, you still attempt to conduct statistical analysis (what seems like t-tests and Man-Whitney U tests) on the data. With the arguments you present for the small-scale study, a question of validity regarding these statistics arise. Additionally, there is little discussion regarding these statistics later in the article which questions the need for these. The descriptive statistics alone could be discussed.   
  
>>>We thank the reviewers for recognizing this point and agreed that we had failed to fully integrate the statistics in the original version. We have now explained what we did with the data more fully (including test choice and why). We recognize that sample size was small. However, we have chosen to keep the brief coverage of the inferential statistics because a) they were sufficiently powered to identified a significant difference (for Padlet) b) the pattern of significant differences, or lack of is in line with the qualitative feedback. However, should the editor wish for us to remove the inferential statistics and only include the descriptive we will do so. We have now also attempted to integrate this more into the remainder of the paper.

2) method – please clarify the breakdown of participants – how many  
staff and students? The Likert Scale mentioned in Figure 2 is not mentioned  
in the method section. Was this included in the focus group or applied  
after? This is unclear. Please explain further the type of questions  
included to prompt discussion in the focus group.

>>> We are grateful to the reviewers for the remarks. We've added some remarks about when the Likert scale was used, and also given examples of questions to prompt discussion.  
  
3) The relevance of the number of words collected from the focus groups  
(e.g. n=15,000) is unclear. If this type of data is included, discourse  
analysis should be applied to consider the percentage of fillers/discourse  
markers which are irrelevant to the content of the discussion.  
  
>>> We thank the reviewers for the comments, and have removed this specific number as it wasn't germane to the main thrust of the paper.

4) You mentioned that you assumed participants would not be familiar with  
the technologies. Was this checked? Prior familiarity with technologies may  
have affected usability and comments in the focus group. This could be  
considered in the discussion.   
  
>>> We are grateful to the reviewers for the comments. We attempted to get staff with a range of prior experience to best reflect the make-up of the staff/student population in general, and discussed this verbally with them. We agree that prior familiarity could have affected comments, and have described how we attempted to mitigate this with a more standard benchmark in the discussion.  
  
5) At times, the writing is overly subjective. For example, "where the  
beauty and excitement of learning about the stars could add a genuine  
educational context to the session". This is rather subjective and dependent  
on the subject/faculty/interest of the participants. Please proof read and  
address this.

>>> We thank the reviewers for the comments. We've removed those specific remarks, and re-framed discussion in a more passive/neutral tone.  
  
6) From the procedure, it looks as if the participants only spend a total of  
16 minutes on each technology before being expected to make an opinion on  
them. You could consider whether this is enough in the discussion.   
  
>>> We are grateful to the reviewers for the comments. We have put a short paragraph in the discussion discussing this point, stating that subsequent researchers may want to add extra time for further experience. We also contextualized this time by noting that this was part of a 2 hour session where participants could spend as much as they wanted on a specific tool. Further we would note also participants were willing and able to offer thoughts and opinions - none offered distancing remarks of the type 'I need further time to give a considered opinion'. Nonetheless, we recognize that other researchers may want to do a session longer than 2 hours, or structure the study differently and have noted this in the discussion.

7) During Theme 2 Ease of Use, there are only comments from staff. It would  
be interesting to comment on why this is.

>>> We thank the reviewers for the comments. This is an oversight in the way we've presented the data as in the original data there were actually a number of remarks from both staff and students relating to this theme, and have included some further comments from both to balance this.  
  
8) In-text citations need to be checked throughout.  
  
>>> We are grateful to the reviewers for this remark, and have reviewed the in-text citations, finding several errors and correcting them.

9) Suggestion - The reviewers suggested reading about TPACK (Technological pedagogical content knowledge)- (Koehler and Mishra, 2009), as it is directly interlinked with your topic. Due to the reason that your keywords and findings are based around pedagogy and ‘enhancing current lecture practice’. Although you indirectly highlight these, the direct focus on a  
teacher’s technological pedagogical content is missing. It also fits directly with your theme and will provide a stronger foundation for your discussion., As a teacher’s knowledge on how to use a certain digital tool may be different to others who are more digitally advanced (as advocated by TPACK).

>>> We thank the reviewers for the comments. We agree the TPACK framework provides a useful overview, and the framework of Koehler and Mishra, (2009) was in our minds before we structured the sessions. (Just to prove that this is the case, we actually had their framework on our departmental website for several years, which one can see on an out of date copy of our page [here](http://www.findglocal.com/GB/London/174367572767123/Centre-for-Techonology-Enhanced-Learning-King%27s-College-London)). We have woven some references to this in introduction and in the main body of the text.  
  
10) Suggestion – consider changing the title to ‘e-lecture’ digital  
tools instead of ‘in-lecture tools’ to more clearly express the idea of  
educational technology. The reviewers questioned how well ‘in-lecture’  
reflects the content of the article.

>>> We are grateful to the reviewers for the suggestion, and have decided to slightly rename the paper. We agree that e-learning is important, but the digital technologies were aimed for both online and face to face delivery, so we felt 'in-lecture' was more appropriate in this instance.

We look forward to hearing from you.

[Researcher names redacted]

We look forward to your edited paper. There is no set deadline for this so  
please take the time you need. Thank you for your interest in and  
contribution to Compass.   
  
Best wishes,  
Rachel  
Compass Co-Editor  
\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  
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