**Project 15885 -- Issues to Address**

Much improved!

I’m currently still focused on getting the alignment of **RQs and Hypotheses, Method and Measures, and Analyses for the Quant section** in order first. I have barely looked at the Intro or the Qual stuff because these sections need to be in order to make sure the rest of the document is mutually supportive.

It’s like writing a mystery and needing to be clear that “the Butler did it” (and how) before setting up the rest of the story.

This draft has introduced a confusion by using the term “engagement score” out of the blue in the results section. Ditto, there was mention of “virtual engagement” and so I created a column for it based on the working of

1. Describing the two existing measures used. Where did they come from? How many items? What scale? What anchors? Which language? Were they adapted? If so, how? Were only subsets of items used?

Most of this information has now been provided, but there are still some missing details; see MS comments

1. Which demographic variables were measured in order to make subgroup comparisons (e.g., military rank, length of time in WW, how frequent is participation etc. and how were all of these assessed? Open-ended questions or selecting categories? Were any categories collapsed?

This information has been added. In a couple places I question why the information was collapsed. Perhaps this can be part of our Zoom conversation.

There is an issue with one of the “median split” procedures. See comments.

1. Decide if the SOV and SCI do use Likert-style response choices, if you will consider these to be ordinal only and then use Spearman’s. If you decide to analyze them as parametric, using Pearson’s r, then be consistent and use t-tests and anovas for other analyses.

This has been addressed; but the choice of some of the analyses may need to be revisited…

The “Range” column of the Table is confusing (see separate document) and needs to be clear what is being reported here.

1. Any analysis in the Results section should be previewed with a research question or hypothesis.

This is better, but there were analyses that popped up without being previewed. See assorted places for edits.

1. All analyses, where appropriate, should include descriptive statistics, followed by the inferential statistics and other necessary info (test statistic, p value, n, …)

Also better; but let’s revisit

1. Make sure that correlational analyses do not include any causal language

Didn’t notice any but wasn’t being vigilant! Will look again after next revision.

7.

The SOV and SOC are not particularly well differentiated.

There should be further development of the sections describing the concepts/constructs. How they are similar and how are they different? Is there any reason they would not be correlated in some way?

I saw a section on this but will check more thoroughly on next revision.

Next steps

The quantitative section needs to be completely clear and unambiguous to be reviewed well. I know that the intro will fall into place based on the previous MS I worked on.

I’d like you to completely ignore every section of the paper other than the RQs that are answered by the n = 204 quantitative data, the details about what data were collected, how and why any transformations were made (e.g., binning ordinal measures), and making sure the form of the question or hypothesis aligns such that the statistical analysis would be obvious to a reviewer because of the language and the measurement level of the variable (continuous/ordinal or categorical)

(e.g., “relationship” questions should be answered with r or chi-square; “difference” questions should be answered with anovas or t-tests)