Title: Discovering Differential Impacts of the COVID-19 Pandemic on the Education Workforce
Corresponding Author: Kristen Wilcox, Associate Professor, University at Albany

"The core idea and primary data were great strengths to this effort. Here are some recommendations for the authors to improve their organization, theoretical support, and analysis strategy that will hopefully help as they move forward with their data collection and a full manuscript.

1. Paper organization. I didn't always have a clear idea of your project's goals and contributions. I'd recommend some clear statements upfront to address your purpose and contribution with this chapter. You do get there in the second section (although research q's don't come until the Method), so hitting this earlier helps set the stage. You also mention something about "a new kind of workforce stress" that I didn't really understand or see developed/mentioned elsewhere.

2. Theoretical support. I found your background to be somewhat lacking in theoretical support. I know there were space limitations to consider, so I'm sure this will be better developed in the full paper, but I'd recommend including more evidence and citations to support your claims (e.g., regarding overemphasis on students vs. educators, connections between stress, satisfaction, and turnover). I also found that by the time you were introducing your research q's, I hadn't seen a clear rationale as to why you would expect educators who work and live in districts and schools that serve different subpopulations to be more adversely affected by COVID. Some theoretical justification for this would help explain the cause (and solution) of these disparities. For example, maybe you could connect the organizational social capital and occupational stress theories more explicitly (e.g., that increased demands, fewer resources, lead to more distress and work-family conflict for educators in districts/communities with less organizational social capital, leading to lower satisfaction and performance, as well as higher turnover intentions). I'd recommend Greenhaus & Allen (2011) and Ten Brummelhuis & Bakker (2012) to help connect occupational stress with work-family conflict and job demands-resources models.

3. Analysis strategy. Although I can see the value in splitting up your sample into groups of low, medium, and high levels of economic disadvantage %, this approach is limiting for a number of reasons. First, I'm not sure what percent of your sample falls into each category and how the differences in levels were determined. Second, and more importantly, all the variables you analyzed (% ED, stress, satisfaction, turnover intentions) are measured on a continuous scale, so it's not appropriate (or necessary) to create discrete categorical groups. Instead, I would recommend analyzing your results in a regression framework that allows you to explore the full continuum of each scale. For example, when predicting stress you could use %ED as the independent variable and pre-COVID stress as the dependent variable. Next, when predicting COVID stress you could enter pre-COVID stress as the predictor in Block 1 of a hierarchical regression and then %ED as the second predictor in Block 2 to determine whether ED accounts for variance in COVID stress beyond general pre-COVID stress levels. This conserves statistical power and sidesteps artificial group creation to better test these relationships. I also didn't see any results on turnover intentions (there was some mention in the conclusion, but I had trouble following it) or results connecting stress and turnover intentions. I also had questions about your approach to qualitative data analysis. Did you institute some sort of coding scheme or text analysis?

Thanks for sharing your work! Very interesting and important topic!"

"Great work, interesting topic. Please use Chicago style (notes-bib). "