**REVISION EXPLANATION**

(Reviewers’ comments are copied in black and our revision explanations are in red)

1. The reviewers found the year-long length of the study to be surprising. If only one problem (task) was used it seems as if the five-step process would be most effective if completed over a month or two and not drawn out over a year. It would be helpful to clarify the need for a year-long study. Does this professional development tool require a year-long commitment?

This study is based on a professional development (PD) activity in task design and analysis. The activity was included as part of a year-long professional development program, aimed to improve a teacher’s pedagogical and pedagogical content knowledge. The task design and analysis activity presented in the manuscript was implemented during the fall semester. Additional explanation is added in the first page and in the Methods section. Timeline also added in Table 2.

1. More detail is needed on the demographics of the participants (gender, years of teaching experience, etc.) and the nature of workshops that were part of the research design (hours, sessions for this particular content).

Additional information provided in the Methods section. Table 1 has been added to summarize participants’ demographic information.

1. The results in the paper do not appear to provide an answer to research question #2 so this needs to be addressed.

Section headings are renamed. The new Discussion section is extended to include the answer to the second goal of this study.

1. Since results and discussion sections are combined here, the discussion of the results generally needs to be expanded and made more accessible to a wider audience, in particular with a look at the research questions and the theoretical framework.

Section headings are renamed. The new Discussion section is extended to include the discussion of the conceptual framework of the study and analytical frameworks of analysis of student work.

1. In section 4.3, teachers' revision patterns are explained and this explanation is accompanied by Figure 8. The reviewers assumed that the number on the figure represents the number of participants and thus requested putting a note on the figure. Moreover, the number of each division area adds up to more than 30 (number of participants) so the reviewers suggested to add clearer explanations of Figure 8, especially since under Figure 8, there is a sentence which may not be clear to readers: “Some gave the price of an item asked the price of the other item.” Figure 8 needs to be revised. The reviewers requested that the vertical axis be labeled as percentage. Moreover, the reviewers wondered if the 0’s at the top and/or bottom of several items are needed.

Figure 8 is revised. Explanations of Figure 8 (under Figure 8) are revised.

1. Figures 3c, 6, and 7 hard to read and should be presented more clearly.

Figures 3C, 5, 6, 7, and 10 are replaced with clearer versions.

1. Finally, the reviewers also commented that the manuscript is in need of thorough editing, perhaps by an outsider editor, of English language use (various grammatical issues throughout the manuscript)

The manuscript has been edited by a native speaker.

1. APA style (Section headings, labeling of figures and tables, direct quotes longer than 40 words, etc.)

The manuscript has been edited to follow APA style; Section headings, labels of figures and tables, quotations, and indentations.