For research article

3681112 Prospective Teachers View on Mathematics Education Curriculum Transformation in Preschool in Latvia

Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

1. Summary

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the reviewer for their meticulous reading, insightful comments, and constructive suggestions. We would like to express our sincere gratitude for the time and expertise dedicated to the evaluation of our manuscript, entitled "Prospective Teachers' Views on Mathematics Education Curriculum Transformation in Preschool in Latvia."

In consideration of the feedback received, the comments have been duly noted and the suggested corrections and clarifications have been incorporated into the manuscript. A comprehensive response is provided below, with the corresponding revisions clearly indicated in the point-by-point response letter.

It is our conviction that these amendments have served to enhance the clarity, precision, and overall contribution of the manuscript. We are truly grateful for the reviewer's valuable input and hope that the revised version meets the expectations of both the reviewer and the editorial team.

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

Comment 1:

In the introduction the authors refer to many different topics, as they address these in their research questions, but the single topics are not discussed first on a theoretical level before they look on the awareness of the prospective teacher's in the different document. This comment is not addressed sufficiently. The framework is now not clearer. Just one sentence about the beliefs is added and some references.

Response 1

Thank you for this observation. We acknowledge that our previous revision did not fully address the need for a clearer theoretical framework. In response, we have now significantly expanded the theoretical section of the introduction by incorporating a detailed explanation of the main concepts, supported by relevant literature (e.g., (Baroody et al., 2019; Veldhuis & van den Heuvel-Panhuizen, 2020; Björklund et al., 2020; Van den Heuvel-Panhuizen & Becker, 2003; Cohrssen et al., 2013; Clements & Sarama, 2009; Grimmond et al., 2022). We believe this addition clarifies the conceptual basis for our study and strengthens the connection between our research questions and the literature. This revised section now precedes the research aim and provides a more coherent and structured framework for the analysis that follows.

This change has been implemented and is specified on page 2, paragraph 2,3,4,5 of the revised manuscript, on page 2, paragraph 2 of the revised manuscript.

Comment 2: *The authors refer to children's mathematical skills in general, to their achievements and to problem solving skills, here it would be nice if the focus would be clearer. Later on in the discussion many papers are referred to, which are not discussed in the theoretical section.*
The authors decided not to address this comment with reference to their national context. But this paper is published in an international paper.

Response 2

Thank you for this observation. We sincerely thank the reviewer for this thoughtful comment. We acknowledge the suggestion to provide a clearer focus regarding children's mathematical skills, achievements, and problem-solving abilities, as well as the recommendation to incorporate more of the discussion references into the theoretical section. We believe this addition clarifies the conceptual basis for our study and strengthens the connection between our research questions and the literature. This revised section now precedes the research aim and provides a more coherent and structured framework for the analysis that follows.
This change has been implemented and is specified on page 1, paragraph 1 of the revised manuscript.

Comment 3: *The first research question addresses quite more different concepts, which are not discussed earlier in theoretical section but later on in the discussion: How do prospective teachers perceive the aim, content, assessment and teaching/learning process of mathematics education in the mathematics curricula?*
This comment is not addressed sufficiently: The authors have now only added brief references to those earlier works in the manuscript but this did not provide context and support for the current analysis. The structure is not clear.

Response 3

We sincerely thank the reviewer for highlighting this important point. We acknowledge that the first research question encompasses multiple key concepts—aim, content, assessment, and the teaching/learning process—which are explored in more detail later in the discussion section. To address this, we have added clarifying references in the theoretical section to ensure better alignment with the research question. This change has been implemented and is specified on page 2, paragraph 2,3,4,5 of the revised manuscript, on page 2, paragraph 2 of the revised manuscript.

3. Additional clarifications

We would like to express our sincere gratitude once again to the reviewer for their invaluable contributions, and it is our sincere hope that the revised version will be able to meet the expectations of both the reviewer and the editorial team.