

Response to Reviewer 1

Dear Reviewer, Thank you for your constructive and insightful comments. Your feedback has been instrumental in strengthening the methodological transparency and empirical weight of our manuscript. Below are our point-by-point responses to your suggestions:

1. Literature Review & Theory

- **Comment:** The theoretical section is more descriptive than analytical, and there is a lack of a clear theoretical "bridge" between the DOE framework and the empirical indicators.
- **Response:** We have constructed a clear theoretical bridge in Section 2.6 by explicitly operationalizing the national DOE framework into the two empirical dimensions measured in Phase 3 (Entrepreneurial Characteristics and Creative/Innovative Skills). We have also enhanced the analytical depth of the literature review to better highlight conceptual differences.

2. Methodology

- **Comment:** The mixed-methods design and the integration of qualitative and quantitative data (triangulation) are not sufficiently demonstrated.
- **Response:** We have specified in Section 3.1 that the study employed a "convergent parallel mixed-methods design" and explicitly explained how qualitative and quantitative data were integrated to formulate meta-inferences. Additionally, we expanded Section 3.4 to detail the "hybrid thematic analysis," confirming that the process incorporated both deductive and inductive coding and established inter-rater consensus.

3. Results (Quantitative Data)

- **Comment:** Quantitative data are presented fragmentarily without detailed statistical indicators (means, standard deviations, scales) linking to the "Innovative Co-creator" dimensions.
- **Response:** We completely agree. We have integrated detailed quantitative data by adding a new, comprehensive statistical table (Table 3) in Section 4.3.1. This table clearly presents Pre- and Post-Implementation Means and Standard Deviations across all stakeholder groups (teachers, students, and parents) using a 5-point Likert scale, explicitly linking them to the dimensions of the "Innovative Co-creator".

4. Discussion and Conclusion

- **Comment:** The discussion lacks critical reflection on challenges (power relations, small sample size), and the conclusion claims a "scalable and transferable blueprint," which appears somewhat overstated.
- **Response:** We have addressed this by creating a dedicated "Section 6. Limitations and Future Research" to critically reflect on the study's constraints, including the limited sample size. Furthermore, we softened the generalized claims in the conclusion, moderating the description from a "scalable and transferable blueprint" to a "promising, contextually adaptable model" to accurately reflect the study's qualitative scope.

Thank you again for your valuable guidance.