

Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

Point 1: Some parts of the text are poorly (or not at all) sourced (see 2.1.1; 2.1.3.1; 2.2.3.1), which makes it unclear whether we are dealing with the opinions of the authors or the knowledge of recognized authorities. A large part of the bibliography (especially the most recent ones!!!) is not used in the article, this needs to be corrected and completed.

Response 1: Pointed-up paragraphs 2.1.1; 2.1.3.1; 2.2.3.1 are enriched with the opinions of the recognized authorities. The bibliography on which the text is based is now more clearly included and used in the article.

Point 2: In order to emphasize the need for interdisciplinary reflection on the role of music in religious education, the authors point to the need for collaboration between religious educators, music educators, and conductors. A legitimate question is whether this group should be extended to include theologians (catechists) for theoretical reflection on the role of music in religious education?

Response 2: The topic is very vivid and has a strong intention to collaborate between disciplines. In this stage, one of the main aims was to point out that active musicians (conductor) could help at the starting point of using musical content in RE. Speaking of future work, there would be a broad space collaboration is a necessity to collaborate with theologians (catechists) for the theoretical reflection on the role of music in religious education. Hence, it would be a privilege in the future to make this dialogue among disciplines (for example when preparing the handbook for RE teachers) to avoid incompetence in any of the involved sectors. We have shared this thought in the footnote 20.

Point 3: The authors of the article use the phrase "via pulcherinibus" - it begs to be supplemented that the authors of the *Directory for Catechesis* of 2020 (p. 106-109) call for the renewal of this path in catechesis, inspired by the thoughts of Pope Francis from the exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium* of 2013 (p. 167);

Response 3: We are very thankful for instructing us on the references that we added to footnote 1.

Point 4: When we refer to another author for the first time, it is worth using the whole name or initial (see line 294) and when referring to him again only the last name (see line 304) - in the latter case we learn that that the author of "something" thinks, but we do not know where we find these thoughts.

Response 4: We have made the mentioned points clearer now, thank you for your recommendation.

Point 5: Description of the tests in sub-section 2.3. is so general that it is difficult to assess how much it is needed in the article and how much it affects the conclusions. Research has its own methodology, framework in which it takes place, hypotheses that are later verified - in this case we do not find out

what they were about and what similarities or differences characterize the two studied (observed) groups.

Response 5: We added a few things to the sub-section 2.3 that might give a better picture of the importance of comparing these two groups. We share this comparison to point out that methods that could help children to be involved in the interdisciplinary teaching process already exist. The main goal while comparing amateur choir singing with classroom singing is to avoid improvisation in the music field whether constructive, proven and easy-to-use methods already exist in the field of modern conducting. Hence, this article aims to encourage the idea of interdisciplinary learning while using the best of each discipline included in the process.

If there is still a sense of unnecessary, we would be pleased to remove the sub-section 2.3.