

Journal: [Social Sciences](#) (ISSN 2076-0760)

Manuscript ID: socsci-2546192

Type: Brief Report

Title: Reflections on the impact of an Intergenerational Digital Storytelling Program (DST) on changing attitudes and fostering dialogue and understanding through meaningful conversations across the generations.

Special Issue: [Selected Papers from 11th International Digital Storytelling Conference 2023: Radical Listening: Story Work for a Just Future](#)

Response to Reviewer 4 Comments

1. Summary

The authors would like to extend our sincere gratitude for taking the time to review our article. We greatly appreciate your feedback and your acknowledgment of the importance of the intergenerational program discussed in our work.

We understand your comment regarding the structure of our article not aligning with the classic format of a scientific article. When we initially submitted our work to this journal, it was our intention to present a reflective piece that delved into the nuances and implications of the program in question. Moreover, upon acceptance by the journal and within the context of this special issue, which is closely linked to a recent conference where we presented this material as an oral presentation, we were under the impression that this approach was acceptable.

In fact, the journal suggested that we submit our article in the format of a 'Brief Report,' described as follows: "Brief reports are short, observational studies that report preliminary results or a short complete study or protocol. Brief reports usually contain two figures and/or a table; however, the Materials and Methods sections should be detailed to ensure reproducibility of the presented work. The structure is similar to that of an article, and there is a suggested minimum word count of 2500 words."

We would like to assure the reviewer that authors take their feedback seriously and acknowledge the importance of adhering to the standards and requirements of the journal. While our article may deviate from the classic scientific article format due to the unique nature of our work, we recognize the need to align with more conventional academic expectations, including the inclusion of more up-to-date references. We will thoroughly review and revise our submission accordingly.

Once again, we appreciate your thoughtful review and guidance, and we are committed to making the necessary revisions to ensure that our article meets the standards of the journal.

Thank you for your valuable feedback and understanding of the special circumstances surrounding our submission.

2. Questions for General Evaluation	Reviewer's Evaluation	Response and Revisions
Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic?	Not applicable	
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	Must be improved	The authors have reviewed the existing cited references and ensured they are relevant to the research.
Are the research design, questions, hypotheses and methods clearly stated?	Not applicable	
Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced and compelling?	Not applicable	
For empirical research, are the results clearly presented?	Must be improved	The authors are not presenting the results to any empirical research within this article. We endeavor to present the evaluation data of the PADSIP program in future publications.
Is the article adequately referenced?	Must be improved	The authors have included up-to-date and relevant references throughout the article, e.g., line 344-345,
Are the conclusions thoroughly supported by the results presented in the article or referenced in secondary literature?	Must be improved	

3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

N/A

4. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language

Reviewer input: "I am not qualified to assess the quality of English in this paper"