The following changes have been made on the Manuscript “**Factors Influencing Tandem Learning in Mathematics**” in accordance with reviewers’ comments

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Reviewer’s comments | Changes made | Page (see highlights) |
| Multiple language typos. | Resolved them. | NA |
| Make references to other articles published in our journal. | Added 5 references to IJS journal throughout the manuscript. | NA |
| Whose population? What criteria? What sampling technique? | Continued sample subsection to include population, sampling technique, and inclusion/exclusion criteria. | 8 |
| Write everything in black without underlining | In data-analysis section removed hyperlinks and other formatting tools. | 10 |
| In discussion section: Is it measuring efficacy? Please maintain consistency | Changed: *Therefore, the aim of the present research was to investigate the various elements influencing tandem learning, particularly focusing on the factors that contribute to the success of this collaborative approach*. to … *focusing on the factors that contribute to the success of this collaborative approach*. | 15 |
| Title, abstract, summary (and keywords): The abstract needs to be supplemented with more detailed research methods. | In abstract, added the location, timeframe, and subject as well as named all the dependent and independent variables used. | 1 |
| In research methods: it is necessary to explain: (1) the advantages of the MI and RFE methods chosen compared to other similar methods, (2) data analysis steps using MI and RFE machine learning | Added in Machine learning in education section about how RFE prevents overfitting, and that MI does not assume linear relationships. | 7 |
| Other issues: the number of samples was only 89 students and should have used non-parametric analysis | Added in Machine learning in education section about how MI is non-parametric, while RFE depends on the specific model used. | 7 |
| Manuscript is too long | Deleted diagram of components of the group-learning  Deleted paragraph about pros and cons of group learning as it somewhat duplicated with the eponymous table  Deleted theoretical views on the achievement effects of cooperative learning  Deleted group forming subsection  Deleted feature selection section  Merge details of MI and RFE methods from Methods to Introduction  Deleted correlation subsection (in preliminary analysis) in Results  In limitations section deleted the part about feature selection (called dimensionality reduction) | 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 15 |
| Authors often write variables, but do not explain what is meant by the variable, this is also found in writing conclusions | Written all the independent variables in abstract  Specified what was dependent variable in methods – procedure  Solved the dilemma of target = dependent = outcome of interest, and predictor variable = feature variable = factor | 1, 7, 9 |
| In introduction, labels of factors were not one-to-one consistent with the abstract | Added the specific factors tested in the last paragraph of the Introduction section | 2 |
| Subsection names “Variables That May Impact Group Learning” is not appropriate | Changed subsection name to “Factors Influencing Tandem Learning” (Tega nisem še spremenil v dokumentu!) | 4 |
| In the section Factors Influencing Tadem Learning, can you explain which factors are the most influential? and what is the argument for choosing the factors to be analyzed? Can you relate it to the model you used as a reference above? | Added Based on the abovementioned literature, it is impossible to establish which factor might have the greatest impact on students’ opinions about the effectiveness of tandem learning in mathematics. Therefore, an exploratory study is proposed. | 5 |
| In Method section, please explain the method and design used, and dependent and independent variables!!! | Not changed methodology and design as the called-for information is stated below in same section, subsection procedure. In first paragraph we cleared up what was meant with certain variable types (i.e. dependency and subtype) | 6 |
| Consistency throughout | The splits of cognitive/non cognitive, general, etc. was merged onto the split of general-demographic, psychological, and tandem-related variable subtypes | 2 and throughout |
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