**Dear Laura Gomez,**

This reconciliation letter includes explanations about the implemented changes. The complete amendments can be found in the resubmitted manuscript.

**Reviewer Comments #1**

The purpose statement for the study is clear and the author chose to use a mixed methods approach, which allowed insight into the feelings and perceptions of the people who would be directly affected by the outcome of implementing EMI in Iranian Universities. The quantitative portion of the study allowed the author to get data from many participants, giving a more in-depth view of the participants’ views and concerns. This study is definitely relevant to the field of second language learning (L2) and learning English as a Second Language (ESL). With the continued globalization of today’s world, it is vitally important for students, especially those entering fields providing opportunities for jobs in the U.S. and other large English speaking countries, to learn academic English so that they will be able to effectively compete in their chosen job market. In Europe, English is the dominant L2 of instruction (Coleman, 2006). English is emerging as the language of global business and industry, making it important for students in non-English speaking countries to have a good grasp, not only of social English, but also of academic English, Students will need to have the ability to put what they have learned into practice in real life situations (Coleman, 2006). There were some minor punctuation errors and some sentences needed to be reworded for clarity. Once these revisions are made, this article will be ready for submission

The amendments regarding punctuation and structure were made in the following pages of the article: 1,2,3,5,6,10, and16.

**Reviewer Comments #2**

1. What portions of the paper should be expanded? Removed? Condensed? Summarized? Combined?

 Literature Review is presented in only one section. Literature Review should be sectioned under English as the Medium of Instruction, University Education and Internationalization as they are the key words in the abstract. There should be more details on the limitation rather than one last line in the study.

Literature Review is sectioned under University Education and Internationalization, and English as the Medium of Instruction.

The following paragraph concerning the limitation is added to the end of the study:

However, due to the some limitations the results should be treated cautiously. First, although the present study was to consider the feasibility of adopting EMI in Iranian universities, the data were collected from only one university, namely, the UB. Some research studies can be conducted while considering universities in different cities of Iran. Second, the present study was conducted just in a state university. Other studies can focus on private universities. Third, there were a limited number of participants. Other studies can be conducted to include more subjects.

1. Is the title informative?

 Feasibility of adopting English medium instruction at Iranian Universities explains the acceptance of using English as the medium of instruction among the lecturers and students in the Iranian universities. However, it was mentioned that the accessible population for the study is in University of Bojnord.

No. The informative titles usually include the “answer” within the title for studies whose results might be overruled by later studies.

Are the cited articles/papers current?

 The papers cited for English as the medium of instruction are from 1997 to 2006. The papers cited for university education cited from 1997 to 2007 while the papers cited for internationalization are from 2012. The issues for internationalization come mostly from the newspapers in the target community.

More recent references were added to the article: Chang (2010); Wong (2009); Shah abadi, et. al., (2008); Manakul (2007).

1. Is the literature review comprehensive?

 The literature review discussed the key words mentioned in the abstract. The time span chosen for the papers cited range from 1997 to 2012. The development of the use of English to the current issue of internationalization are covered in the time span discussed.

More recent references were added to the article: Chang (2010); Wong (2009); Shah abadi, et. al., (2008); Manakul (2007).

1. Does the literature review contain a coherent argument supported by literature (as opposed to a list of studies)?

 The ideas were discussed in a good argument in the paragraphs. Most of the paragraphs contained one or two citations which show good explanation.

1. In the quantitative method, again the label ‘Table 1’ is used to describe independent sample t-test for lecturer and students perception on adopting English as medium of instruction in the university. It could be labelled as Table 4. Levene’s Test for equality of variances was described to check whether the lecturers and the students have different perception. Independent sample t-test for the subjects’ perception on English as medium of instruction is again labelled as Table 1, which is confusing. This could easily be labelled as Table 4.

The amendments were made on page 25.

1. The limitation should be explained in details rather than one line.

 The following paragraph concerning limitations was added to the end of the article:

However, due to the some limitations the results should be treated cautiously. First, although the present study was to consider the feasibility of adopting EMI in Iranian universities, the data were collected from only one university, namely, the UB. Some research studies can be conducted while considering universities in different cities of Iran. Second, the present study was conducted just in a state university. Other studies can focus on private universities. Third, there were a limited number of participants. Other studies can be conducted to include more subjects.

**Reviewer Comments #3**

* The sample size, as noted in the abstract, is confusing. Was it six students and six lecturers OR 344 students and 36 lecturers?

As mentioned in the methodology section, the study was conducted in two phases: interview and survey questionnaire. The sample size in the first phase (interview) included six students and six lecturers. And the sample size in the second phase (survey questionnaire) included 344 students and 36 lecturers.

In order to prevent misconception a sentence in the abstract is reworded as:

Six undergraduate students and six lecturers were purposively selected for the interviews.

* The paper presents far too much detail for a one-hypothesis paper for CIE: definitions re: terms understood by academic readers (pp.10, 19, 20, 25), interviewee profiles (pp. 12-13), and email interview questions (pp. 17-19). Much could and should be aggregated.

This is the nature of mixed-methods research design in which the quantitative phase (survey questionnaire) gives a general picture and the qualitative phase (interview) provides more in-depth information.

* How were the main themes in Tables 2, 3 organized? This is unclear.

Two general questions were asked from 12 informants at the UB to gather the qualitative data in the first phase of the study. The first question was asked about the potential advantages and disadvantages of adopting EMI at Iranian universities. The researcher summarized the main theme each informant talked about in Table 2. The second question was asked about the extent the informants agreed with adopting EMI at Iranian Universities. The informants’ ideas regarding this question were shown in Table 3.

* In the Discussion on p. 25, how were the items listed as "the main reasons for using EMI in Europe"? This is also unclear.

The mentioned items are quoted by Coleman (2006). He names the main reasons for using EMI in Europe as follows:

Coleman (2006) mentions academic internationalization, student exchanges, teaching and research materials’ access, staff mobility, graduate employability, the market in international students, and European content and language integrated learning as the main reasons for using EMI in Europe.

* Research question buried on p. 24 is in the wrong place. What is the difference between Number 1 and Number 1, p. 24? The first could be discarded.

Amendment is made. The first question is deleted.

 The research hypothesis in this phase was as follows:

There is no significant difference between the lecturers’ and students’ perceptions regarding the potential adoption of EMI at Iranian universities.

* The conclusion on p.27 almost seems inconsequential or could be inferred without the study. Perhaps the research question should be different or more rigorous at the outset.

Some amendments were made.

* Half of the cited papers are more than ten years old. Ex. 1970, 1979, 1984, 1991. 1992, 1998, 2002. These do not all appear in the reference pages. The first reference page needs to be on a separate page.

The correspondence between the references mentioned in the body of the article and those mentioned in the reference part was checked. Amendments were made.

 More recent references were added to the article: Chang (2010); Wong (2009); Shah abadi, et. al., (2008); Manakul (2007).