

For “Entomologists in the K-12 Classroom: A Scoping Review”

Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions highlighted in the re-submitted files.

2. Questions for General Evaluation

Reviewer’s Evaluation

Is the work a significant contribution to the field?



Is the work well organized and comprehensively described?



Is the work scientifically sound and not misleading?



Are there appropriate and adequate references to related and previous work?



Is the English used correct and readable?



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

Comment 1: *Line 79: use lowercase e in “Entomology”.*

Response 1: This has been changed, per the reviewer’s comment.

Comment 2: *Lines 89-90: please provide a citation. How is this area less well defined than other entomology outreach efforts that target the public/farmers?*

Response 2: Our intent was to point out the limited number of publications associated with K-12 populations compared to others, not necessarily the extent to which the practice is defined. We have reworded these lines to better convey our intent.

Comment 3: *Lines 114-117: Were Extension-focused journals captured in these searches? It would be a good idea to mention this somewhere in this section.*

Response 3: We have added a statement addressing this concern (see lines 114-115).

Comment 4: *Line 197: Please revise this sentence.*

Response 4: We have fixed the duplicated portions of the sentence, per the reviewer’s comment.

Comment 5: *Line 244: Where do these numbers come from? Based on Table 2, shouldn’t there be 22, 22, and 25 publications involved in engaging grades 6, 7, and 5, respectively?*

Response 5: The table reflects broad grade bands, which we compiled from the grade or grades that each publication focused on. We have generated a new version of table 2 that we hope will help readers better understand the grade levels that are represented in the papers that were ultimately included in the review

Comment 6: Lines 280-282: *This is an opinionated statement that should be revised or cited. I agree that in some cases publications are used to flaunt a completed outreach event. However, I do not believe that a lack of criticism in a manuscript generally means this is the case. For example, the purpose of some manuscripts are to spread excitement within the entomology community, document what others are doing, or showcase ways to target a specific audience.*

Response 6: We agree with the reviewer's point here and have rephrased this section to better portray the argument being touched on in the "Opportunities (4.2)" section

Comment 7: Lines 302-317: *Here the authors discuss the lack of publications in entomology focused journals. In lines 309-312, they mention this trend may result as a "product of hardship experienced by entomologists seeking to publish" these efforts. What are these hardships? In my experience, the biggest limitation to publishing K-12 studies in entomology journals is finding a journal that will accept these types of manuscripts. In Appendix A, the bulk of entomology journal articles are coming from only two journals – Insects and American Entomologist. Please discuss these limitations/hardships in more detail.*

Response 7: The point we were making here was simply that it can be a challenge to get entomology-education work published in traditional entomology avenues. We have simplified the paragraph in question to more clearly make that point.

Comment 8: Lines 321-324: *Here the authors discuss the lack of classroom educators (i.e. non-academic authors) being included as authors. One reason for this that was not discussed is the authorship contribution guidelines provided by journals. In many cases, authors must provide substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work, or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work. Please discuss in more detail how to include classroom educators in these processes.*

Response 8: We revised this section and have incorporated some of the points that the reviewer has raised here. This question of the threshold at which classroom educators should be included as co-authors... is a fascinating and complicated one. A deeper and more comprehensive detailed discussion on this topic likely warrants its own paper, and would be a wonderful companion (or follow-up) publication to our scoping review.

Comment 9: Line 418: *What exactly was PW's author contributions besides editing?*

Response 9: Please note: our contributions section notes that PW was involved in "writing-reviewing and editing". To this end, PW wrote approximately 50% of the introduction, 25% of the methods, 20% of the results and 10% of the discussion.

Comment 10: Figure 1: *In the "reports excluded" box the authors mention that 8 reports were excluded because they were missing students. However, in line 147 they mention that papers were included if they had "one or more teachers and/or students". The 8 excluded papers were missing students, but could they have involved teachers?*

Response 10: Publications involving teachers but not students were included (ex. Golick et al. 2003, Haefner et al. 2006). That particular inclusion criteria only required the participation of at least 1 member of the public education system. These 8 papers were excluded because they failed to meet this requirement, and the figure has been changed to avoid this confusion.

4. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language

Comment: *The manuscript is well written and only requires minor editing (see comments for specific suggestions).*

Response: (in red)

5. Additional clarifications

[Here, mention any other clarifications you would like to provide to the journal editor/reviewer.]