

Result of Review

Title: The actual title was removed

Author(s): The actual names were removed

Decision of Paper Selection

- A. Accept submission, no revisions required
- B. Accept submission, revisions required; please revise the paper according to comments.
- C. Decline submission; you may revise and resubmit for review.
- D. Decline submission.

What should you do? (For accepted papers)

- ✓ Revise the paper according to the comments (if applicable)
- ✓ All authors must agree on the publication, please inform us the agreement by E-mail.
- ✓ You have to pay a publication fee of 400.00USD for the paper.
 - ✧ Please find payment information at: <http://ies-pay.ccsenet.org>
 - ✧ Please notify the editor when payment has been made

Proposed Schedule for Publication

- ✓ Vol. 11, No. 1, January 2018 if you meet above requirements within 2 weeks.
- ✓ e-Version First: the online version may be published soon when the final draft completed
- ✓ You may also ask to publish the paper later, if you need more time for revision or payment.

Additional Information

- ✓ If you want to buy printed journals, please contact with the Editor
- ✓ You may download e-journal in PDF from: <http://ies.ccsenet.org>
- ✓ Any questions please contact with the Editor at: ies@ccsenet.org

Comments from Editor

Evaluation	Grade Please fill a grade of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1(high to low)
Overall evaluation on the paper	4
Contribution to existing knowledge	5
Organization and Readability	4
Soundness of methodology	4
Evidence supports conclusion	4
Adequacy of literature review	5
Comments and Suggestions	
<p>(1) Re-edit the paper according to <i>Paper Submission Guide</i>: www.ccsenet.org/submission</p>	
<p>(2) Respond to the reviewer's comments</p>	
<p>(3) Polish the language of your paper to improve its readability</p>	
<p>(4) Move the footnotes to endnotes</p>	
<p>(5) Add DOI persistent links to those references that have DOIs, please see Paper Submission Guide</p>	
<p>References should not be numbered, so citations in the text with numbers within brackets should be modified as with author's name, publication year and page. For example, (Smith, 1999), please see Paper Submission Guide.</p>	
<p>The authors may retrieve articles' DOIs at: http://www.crossref.org/SimpleTextQuery/</p>	
<p>You can open a free account, to start retrieving articles' DOIs. CrossRef allows you check multiple references. Please read this webpage very carefully. Only articles with assigned DOIs can be retrieved through the above mentioned webpage. http://www.crossref.org/SimpleTextQuery/</p>	
<p>Examples:</p>	
<p>Kornack, D., & Rakic, P. (2001). Cell Proliferation Without Neurogenesis in Adult Primate Neocortex. <i>Science</i>, 294(5549), 2127-2130. http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1065467</p>	
<p>() Others:</p>	

Comments from Reviewer A

❖ Evaluation (Please evaluate the manuscript by grade 1-5)	
5=Excellent 4=Good 3=Average 2=Below Average 1=Poor	
Items	Grade
Contribution to existing knowledge	4
Organization and readability	3
Soundness of methodology	3
Evidence supports conclusion	3
Adequacy of literature review	3
❖ Strengths	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A worthwhile, and potentially valuable, addition to the literature on the topic of Teacher Professional Development; • The title and abstract seem appropriate and adequate; • There is enough original material in the paper to warrant its publication; • The figures and tables seem accurate and satisfactory; • The references are appropriate and free from obvious omissions; • The terminology and nomenclature seem correct; 	
❖ Weaknesses	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main weakness with this paper is in the way it reads. The flow of ideas, particularly in the first four pages, lack clarity. The use of IRE, TPD, DVC, ATO, for example, needed more explanation and should be accompanied by a definition when stated for the first time. Check for repetition, the need for very short sections (e.g., 2.2) and the way in the reader is guided through the paper. • I found the explanation of the methodology, statistics, or theoretical reasoning difficult to follow in places. I am not familiar with all of the descriptions of the quantitative results provided and these would need further checking to ensure the evidence supports the conclusion reached. Once again, check for repetition and a clear alignment of your argument to your research questions. Simplify and clarify. At all times remember your task to guide the reader. • Some grammatical errors. 	
❖ Suggestions to Author/s	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proof read carefully. Some sentences require editing for correct English (very first sentence!). I suggest deleting use of the words, “also, often, thereby, recently, with regard to”. Expand any shortened words, e.g., 22H (p. 4) should be 22 hours. • Cite references for your claim (p. 4) that: “Based on the theoretical assumptions (e.g., ?) and empirical findings (e.g., ?), the Dialogic Video Cycle (DVC)...” • Ensure clarity. Consider re-writing long-winded, clumsy sentences such as: 	

- In the study, it was investigated to what extent teachers participating in the DVC succeeded with regard to changing practices regarding goal clarity in classroom dialogue.
- In order to analyze to what extent teachers actively and socially exchanged among the community of learners, who participated in the discussion was coded, which included the facilitator, the onscreen teacher, and teachers in the learning community.
- In the present study, we investigated classroom practice of teachers in a practice and video-based intervention...
- Check and expand on the meanings of any words that are either unscientific (e.g., “well” p. 1;) or used on the assumption the reader would know the meaning (e.g., “black-box” p. 2; “concrete talk moves” p.2);
- I’m not sure if the claim that: “The study served as one of the first approaches to relating changes in teachers’ practices to components of effective TPD” could be true. In what sense? One of the first? This would need to be verified/explained or deleted.
- I enjoyed reading the paper and wish you all the best with your next iteration. This is an important topic and your work could be a welcome addition to the literature.

Comments from Reviewer B

❖ Evaluation (Please evaluate the manuscript by grade 1-5)	
5=Excellent 4=Good 3=Average 2=Below Average 1=Poor	
Items	Grade
Contribution to existing knowledge	5
Organization and readability	5
Soundness of methodology	5
Evidence supports conclusion	5
Adequacy of literature review	5
❖ Strengths	
<p>The paper is excellent and it brings valuable contribution to the field of education sciences. The article includes a very good theoretical analysis, has a robust methodological framework, presents very clear and important practical recommendations concerning the use of dialogic video cycles as a relevant tool for teacher professional development.</p> <p>I recommend this study for immediate publication since it has a lot of relevance for the international readers of the journal.</p>	
❖ Weaknesses	
I have no observations for this section.	
❖ Suggestions to Author/s	
I have no observations for this section. The paper is very well-written.	