Response to the reviewer’s feedback

1) Evaluation. You talk about the case study helping students, and in the conclusion you use the phrase 'our case study shows', but there isn't any evidence of this in your paper (though I'm sure it's true). Do you have any evidence for this? For example, quotations from students (even informal), increased student attendance or attainment compared to previous years, teacher observations about student behaviour. This isn't a research study,
so you don't need a large dataset, but without any evaluation or reference to results it does weaken the current draft considerably. I'm sure that the ex-CDE students who act as student ambassadors would happily give quotations, as would staff on the programme, and these would really strengthen the piece and your claims to success. You could also consider
saying how a formal evaluation is/ will be carried out.

**Action taken**

Thank you for this suggestion. Comments on CDE student induction activities have been collected from current and previous CDE students, as well as tutors. These comments are included in Section 2 and support the conclusion in the case study.

2) Literature Consider including more literature on the experience of CDE students and on induction, though you do have some already. It will strengthen the case study further to indicate the evidence (knowledge-base, research findings, scholarship, etc.) that was drawn on to design and develop this induction approach. This would also go some way to supporting the view of its effectiveness (e.g., if it was designed based on research findings supporting the success of such approaches). Most of the literature referenced does not appear to focus on the Chinese or CDE context. I think it will strengthen the rationale for your approaches if you can ground them within literature that focuses more on this specific context. There is so much recent work on both issues, especially CDE issues, including some in Compass.

**Action taken**

We have added references to an additional six articles which focus on the Chinese and CDE contexts.

3) I just add a note of caution that the paper suggests a binary view of Western and Chinese education, i.e., Western active, Chinese passive. This binary also seems to imply, though very unintentionally I am sure, a deficit view of Chinese education/students. There are scholars and papers that challenge the binary view of Western and Chinese education and offer a much more nuanced view of the learning skills that students develop within Confucian heritage cultures. It might be helpful as you continue to draft the paper to review some of this literature. I offer a couple of examples:

o Is the learning approach of students from the Confucian heritage culture
problematic? Thi Tuyet Tran
[https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Thi-Tuyet-Tran/publication/257560822\_Is\_the\_learning\_approach\_of\_students\_from\_the\_Confucian\_heritage\_culture\_problematic/links/5568406c08aec226830127b8/Is-the-learning-approach-of-students-from-the-Confucian-heritage-culture-problematic.pdf](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/iqrNC815GF9AEDZI2RJNr?domain=researchgate.net)

o False Dichotomy? ‘Western’ and ‘Confucian’ concepts of scholarship
and learning, Janette Ryan, Kam Louie
[https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2007.00347.x](https://protect-eu.mimecast.com/s/kKNlC915JF86DLgSO5SRA?domain=doi.org)

**Action taken**

We have referenced Tran’s (2013) paper to illustrate that the view of Chinese students as passive learners has been challenged. Thank you for this suggestion.

4) Some specific points to clarify:

* Abstract “The start of the transition to university”, Is induction really the start of transition? Doesn’t transition begin already at recruitment level?

**Action taken**

The wording in the Abstract has been amended.

* Rationale. The rationale for having a specific induction only for this cohort of students is mentioned in the conclusions, but it should be anticipated and articulated at the start of the case study.

**Action taken**

The rationale has been clarified in Section 1. Introduction.

* Generalisation. It would be good to include a reflection on the dangers of generalising students coming from the same country as if they are an homogenous block. Surely there are many differences also in the Chines student body.

**Action taken**

A reference to Heng (2019) on heterogeneity has been added to the Introduction for reflection.

* p5 “Therefore, at induction we prepare them for this through early exposure to group work with other CDE students only.” This should be anticipated and supported by a strong rationale and evidence.

**Action taken**

The rationale of including only CDE students in the group activity has been clarified.