

## **Editor's Comment:**

**Abstract:** the authors state that they used interview and observation but next they also mentioned the focus group... maybe they should clarified which methods and analysis techniques were used; was there an observation grid or...?;

**Study Area:** the author is suggested to explain briefly the school system (I was not able to understand what VIII or XII means...)

**Sample:** Authors are suggested to give the reader more participants' demographic characteristics (e.g.: N, age media and standard-deviation scores, etc.) for a full understanding; Why biology classes were chosen to be observed?

**Instruments:** The author is invited to think on reader perspective: imagine that other researcher wants to replicate the study – he/she/them have to know the instrument: how it is constituted? he interview elaboration process as well some reliability testing (pilot-test...) should be reported; further, the interview should described (constitution, number of items, type of answers, organization...); the focus group is not explicit in this part (although is mentioned in abstract) or in results presentation; how was interpreted the results of observation – through content analysis or...?

**Procedures:** The credibility of findings can be assessed if the process of coding and the derivation and identification of themes are made explicit: how were data examined – by how many researchers? A content analysis was performed: How many data coders coded the data? Do authors provided a coding tree? Codes were clustered by similarity, and a theme was identified and described based on each cluster or how was the saturation process? About the validation by “content experts”: was a focus group or...? about descriptive analysis – consistency review was done for item' reliability – how many researchers?

**Results presentation:** is not usual to have two (or more) tables without a comment and so authors are suggested to add some general comments (see figure 2 and 3, and pages 7-9 for example) and is not usual to repeat information both in tables and in text; page 7: what do the authors mean by “30 times students”; in page 10, 3 paragraphs are in yellow – maybe authors could use this information to each figure, respectively; this section should be re-organised;

**Discussion:** it seems that there is no discussion section about observation results... and the discussion should be strengthen: consider to present others evidences confront as well some deep in of this study results; it should also provide detailed interpretation of data, interpreting the significance of the findings of

the work. Citations should be given in support of the findings; what is the worth-value of such a study and how findings could be “used” for teachers of others countries? So, teachers and friends are both facilitators and barriers? – how do authors explain this findings; Findings interpretation needs to some deep– e.g.: what reasons the authors pointed out for a tendency to passive participation? At some point the authors state: “this finding revealed that the definition of classroom participation is understood by students” – in what data are authors based for this statement?; What is the new evidences that this work brings to scientific and real community?

**Conclusion:** maybe authors could suggestions practical questions based on findings

**References:** there is an author (Creswell, 2014) that is cited in page 4 (participants) – but all the rest of references are in numbers and in brackets; please correct according to journal guidelines

**Editing:**

- Revise chapter numbering – Methodology should be no 5 (and not 7.)
- Avoid repetitions
- Figures should be mentioned in the text before they appear – proof throughout

**Editor’s Details:**

Dr. Ana Sofia Pedrosa Gomes dos Santos  
Assistant Professor, Faculdade de Motricidade Humana, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal