|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Dear Reviewers,  Thank you for taking the time to review our paper. Please find details below of how the paper has been changed to reflect your suggestions. I have also attached a version of the paper with track changes in order to see how these changes have been implemented in the context of the paper overall. | |
| Reviewer comments | Way addressed in paper |
| Reviewer comments #1  The purpose of this study was to illustrate the experiences of international students who have a disability. This study is important and relevant to across the discipline of education. I suggest that this manuscript be resubmit for review. The authors provide in-depth analysis of their findings throughout the paper. However, there are gaps within the methodology section that need to be strengthened to provide clarity for the reader. For example, in the methodology section the authors briefly discuss their data collection methods, but this section needs to be expanded. How many participants completed the interviews? What was significant about the interviews highlighted in this manuscript? How was the interview protocol generated? The authors make a great critique describing the limitations of quantitative research, however this point could be made stronger through illustrating current studies that could benefit from qualitative research methods.  This manuscript contributes noteworthy scholarship to the field of education. Strengthening the methodology section will provide a better picture of how the authors conducted their research. | Methodology section has been refined and requested details added regarding significance of interviewees and interview protocol.  Had difficulty finding any studies which use quantitative approaches to critique. Instead I referred to qualitative studies and used these as an argument to say that our study is in alignment with contemporary approaches. |
| Reviewer Comments #2 The author addresses an import topic regarding international students with disabilities. The manuscript is well written and could be strengthened by including how ableism (Hehir) (e.g. internalized ableism) in how such notions also limit the educational and life experiences of individuals. Incorporating a discussion about disabilities studies (e.g. Albrecht) could also add to the substance of the manuscript. Additionally, although minor, I would recommend using a pseudonym in place of the actual name of university where the study took place. Also, the conclusion section is under developed and lengthened it, could strengthen the piece. The title suggests that there is only one experience of international students, and that should be addressed or changed. Lastly, the term disability in the title is singular; and again is there only one “dis/ability.” | Literature about ableism added.  Pseudonym added (McKenzie University)  Some lengthening of conclusion  Title changed |
| Reviewer Comments #3 Reframing the Self is a manuscript that takes an important look at the experience of college students who study away from their home campus. In particular, it continues and broadens the discussion of college students with disabilities. The author pays important attention to student voice and agency through the use of a Bourdieuian framework. I have some concerns about the methodological approach to the paper that stem, only in part, to its organization. The discussion of Bourdieu that introduces the methodological section is in the paper's conceptual framework, and may frame the methodology but is not a part of it. As a result, the author tells the reader about the nuts and bolts of the research process, but does not describe the qualitative methodological theory, or speak at length about their positionality in the work--something that would (or not) come out of taking on a particular methodological approach.  In addition, I am concerned about the lack of interview time spent with the two students, or the data that is provided to draw the conclusions stated in the paper. One hour of interviewing can unearth good data; however, it often requires follow up. This is especially true if the interviews were part of another study and following a particular protocol. Again, the methods section raises questions that require answers in order for the reader to have confidence in the author's findings.  As a side note, "symbolic violence" was not defined in the discussion of Bourdieu's concepts. Consequently it made it more difficult for a reader to understand its use in the discussion section of the piece.  It is often difficult to interpret a quote without appropriate context. For example, on page 10 the reader is told following Mary's quote that her family clearly assumed that university study would be an option for her. Statements such as those need to be either toned down (for how is it really clear) or contextualized (In Asian countries when families use the term "brilliant" it is meant to symbolize college readiness.  The same problem seems to appear with Anna's quote that follows. Again, some of this is about understating, or contextualizing. However, I wonder how much of it is about not having the opportunity to conduct follow-up interviews to gain more clarification regarding the quotes and their meanings.  Finally, in the Capital and Field section on page 12 the authors allude to "the systems" a mention which is made earlier in the piece (regarding blame) but never gets fleshed out. As it is raised again to interpret the data, the role of the system (which I understand to be the university but is not clearly defined) needs to be fleshed out. In addition, I think the argument about the role of the counselor in Anna's life is weakened as the authors frame the argument as one of acculturation rather than explaining the link here to disability. This is nuanced; but there must be a tie-in. Finally the quote to support differences in therapy approaches talks about Asian Americans--this hardly seems like an appropriate comparison. A better example would be one that comes from an Asian country--not the United States. My concerns about data interpretation continue with the discussion of the word "rubbish" on page 14. I had no idea what the participant intended here. | Section about positionality added to frame the methodology and theory.  Details about follow ups with students were added which hadn’t been mentioned in original script.  Definition added.  Both of these statements regarding Mary and Anna were changed (toned down as suggested by the reviewer).  ‘Systems’ has been changed and reworked throughout the paper for clarification.  Removed acculturation – good point reviewer – thanks for pointing out! Reading this section again it made little sense so removed it.  Fleshed out. |