Decision on a SERJ Manuscript

Jennifer Julia Kaplan <jkaplan@uga.edu>

Sun 8/18/2019 2:21 PM

To: Theobold, Allison <allisontheobold@montana.edu>;

📎 1 attachments (68 KB)

SERJ MS 19-001R1jjk.docx;

Dear Allison,

I have received and considered the Associate Editors report for your manuscript titled "HOW ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE GRADUATE STUDENTS ACQUIRE STATISTICAL COMPUTING SKILLS" (SERJ MS 19-001).

Our decision is that the manuscript be accepted pending minor revisions.

Attached to this email is a copy of your manuscript in which I have included many editorial suggestions including all of the ones mentioned below by the AE and reviewers. Please go through the document and review all of my suggestions, accepting those that seem reasonable. One thing you might consider as you work through the suggestions is the number of times you use the word *however*. Please consider removing some instances, being sure that the word is only used to indicate that the current statement contradicts the previous statement in some way.

Once you return a clean copy of the manuscript to me, I will send you the SERJ Copyright transfer form and forward the manuscript to the assistant editor. There should be time to publish in the November 2019 Issue if you can return the manuscript relatively quickly.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Regards,

Jennifer J. Kaplan
Editor of Regular Papers
Statistics Education Research Journal
http://iase-web.org/Publications.php?p=SERJ

Associate Editor Report
Both reviewers and the Associate Editor recommend acceptance of "HOW ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE GRADUATE STUDENTS ACQUIRE STATISTICAL COMPUTING SKILLS" (SERJ MS 19-001) with some very minor revisions. In addition to the reviews, shown below, there are two additional minor points:

- There are several spots in which "statistics" and "applied statistics" are capitalized but should not be. The title of a specific course would be capitalized, but the generic phrase "applied statistics course" would not.
- The caption for Table 1 can be shortened; there is not a need to list all of the information from the columns of the table in the caption. The authors can summarize the content of the table more concisely.

Reviewer 1

I have read through the updated manuscript. I think this paper should be accepted. The authors did a nice job improving the paper and addressed all of my concerns. There is one sentence that I think could be dropped without any other changes related to the IRB—"The survey and interview 274 protocol were approved through the Montana State University Institutional Review Board 275 (AT030918-EX) and written consent to participate was obtained from every participant."

The new prose and added research background from statistics education give this paper a nice backbone and I think it will be a strong contribution to the field.

Reviewer 2

Recommendation
Accept when revised

Overall Evaluation
I am very impressed with the revision of this article – it is clear that a lot of work has gone into this improved version of the manuscript. All of my concerns have been addressed very thoroughly, thank you. I especially like how you have delineated statistical computer skills and general computer or coding skills. I also appreciate the level to which you explain the participants' backgrounds in terms of computing and statistical training. I also feel that the qualitative aspects of the study have been well explained (although, qualitative research is not my area).

I have one very minor point: Line 622 you talk of "Statistics and environment science". I think that should be environmental. I also wonder about the capitalising of statistics but not of environmental science.