**Reviewer Comments**

Most of the reviewers recognized this proposal is innovating and the PI is highly competent. The significant comments were that the Experimental Plan lacks some specific detail. As the expert, the technical details are yours to address, but I can make suggestions.

1. Making room for more details. Overall, the most extensive section is the Preliminary data. There is a lot of discussion of the MMM programming. To make room for more detail in the Experimental Plan, I suggest trying to reduce the MMM discussion (lines 120 - 200). It is a well-developed system, so it seems you can explain the highlights and utility with less detail. This will provide more space for Research Plan details as noted by reviewers 2 (teachers) and 3 (implementation, pedagogy, teacher development). Trying to shorten this section by two paragraphs would provide you will almost a page when combined with the space I created.

3. I suggest that reviewer comments, especially reviewer 2 can be addressed by adding text, additional points in Research Instruments (line 337) and Procedures (line 361).

3. The reviewers seem to understand that the proposal covers two more years and what will be gained. However, I found it difficult on first reading to understand what was learned from the funded grant that led to new hypotheses and objectives for two additional years of funding. For example, Studies 1 and 2 (line 297) seem like short-term studies that would have been done as part the work already funded. To address, this I make suggestions in the margins to clarify what new is being proposed. Maybe this will not be an issue if you are reviewed again by these reviewers. However, I want you to be successful by pointing out any potential issues as a friendly reviewer.