|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Changes |
| A | The paper presents a study of the relation among game performance and player's metacognitive process, in the context of the MetaVals SG.Topics about correlations between game features and learning are very interesting in the SG field, so I think this paper can be appropriate for the Journal aims.The literature review in the field is covered well, anyway I think that the section "Serious Games in HE" can be shortened becouse the audience of theIJSG is practiced with the topic. | The section "Serious Games in HE » has been shortened considering the prior knowledge of the IJSG audience.  |
| A | The quality of research design is good: the research questions are clearly defined, the experimental methodology is correct and described in the rightway and finally the result are reported and commented. However, the two questions seem to me somewhat trivial. I'd like to read a more extended discussion about the importance of conducting the experiment and in what way this can be used to inform designers and researchers. | The research questions has been better justified, and the hypothesis of the LC impact on performance has been better discussed according to the previous study of Peirce, Conlan and Wade (2008)  |
| A | In general the paper gives a good contribution to the literature, but it needs a minor revision in order to highlight more the value of the tworesearch questions. |
| A | The presentation is clear and the language appropriate, but the paper is ina format not in line with IJSG specifications. Author should reformat itaccording to the template. | The format has been changed to meet the IJSG specifications.  |
| B | The paper is interesting and well written. However, it should be improved,in particular enhancing the focus on its actual contribution, in order tomake it suitable for a journal publication. | The conclusions stress the contribution of the paper to the collaborative learning through the use of SG.  |
| B | The main outcome of the paper concerns the two research questions, that however do not receive statistically significant answers. The implicationsof this result should be clearly presented. Also, it is not clear whetherthe two research questions are general (as they should be, in my opinion) orstrictly related to Metavals (as it seems). In the first case, I wouldsuggest stressing why metavals has been used and what its limits are as anexperimental tool. I would also try to better relate the research questions(and answers) to specific features of the game/players, also providingwell-substantiated guidelines, or at least lessons learned from theexperience, for the design of new LC tools and collaborative GBL. | The need for developing the SG MetaVals as a research-oriented SG in order to answer the two main hypothesis has been made elicit after the introduction of the hypothesis.  |
| B | H2. Is correlation the right term to use? I would omit the sentence “basedon the first results of MetaVals game” | Changes done.  |
| B | I would use the term GBL, rather than serious games in section 2. In sect. 2, I would also stress the role of the teacher and the support for other knowledge sources, in order to make the learning process more effective andefficient. | Changes done |
| B | The type of the game is not very clear. The paper should present a synopsis of the gameplay, possibly with some snapshots, also the use in different contexts and with different contents should be explained. What is theadvantage? The conclusions make significant distinctions among the different Metavals applications. These should be introduced before, in order to discuss the impact and data should be reported in order to support theseconclusions. Could this be stated as a limitation of the study? Could you consider data separately? | The game has been better described both in the research questions and the methodology section describing the game.  |
| B | Has the unbalance in the nr. of people in the control group been considered? | The reason of the unbalance has been described in the participants section.  |
| B | The term dyad should be briefly explained when used for the first time. | Done |
| B | Table 1 (divided into two pages) is not easy to read. Context should explain “context of use”. ESADE, Bancomer and other names are not clear (justbefore section 5, deployment onto SMEs/companies should be mentioned as well). If players were divided in dyads how are odd participant numbers possible? The term context is used just after table 1 with a differentmeaning, which could be misleading. It would be better to clarify that ANOVA has been used twice. | We have explained the contexts in the last part of section 4. We have also adapted the table format in order to make it clearer. |
| B | Reasons why results are not statistically significant may be explained. Too easy questions? Too homogeneous users? (which is reasonable they are) Could we argue that collaboration is ok only if there are some acknowledgeable “peers”, or of a teacher’s guidance/supervision? | The discussion has been improved to discuss these aspects.  |
| B | About H2b there is something more in the conclusions (that could be moved here), but why should the use of the LC tool itself imply better performance? | The LC tool impact has been discussed.  |
| B | I would separate discussion from conclusions (to which I would add Future works). | Changes done.  |
| B | The statement before the (O’ Reilly et al. citation is not clear to me) | A clarification has been introduced. |
| B | What results point to the importance of GBL for adult and formal learning?Why? (this should be a analysed before) | This point has been further discussed.  |
| B | From what do you say that the third part of the game has been largely ignored by players? This should be stated since the experiment presentation section, since it is a major limitation for the experiment’s outcomes. | The participants’ ignorance of the 3rd phase of the SG MetaVals has been further discussed. |
| B | In general, it should be more clear what is Metvals-specific and what can be considered as general. | The general/specific aspects of MetaVals have been further discussed. |
| B | Typos: performance is uncountable, thus has no plural. Before “Instruments and materials”, item 2 is incorrectly reported twice. Equality of variances. | Changes done |
| B | BibliographyI would suggest adding the Bellotti et al. VS-Games 2012 paper about SGs in higher education and the one by Islas Sedano et al. about collaborative and cooperative games. | The reference has been included.  |
| C | The paper discusses two interesting research questions about learners’ collaboration in a serious game.Is Metavals representative of serious games (or a category of them) or of current or future practices of game-based learning? The conduction of the experiment, and the game as well (in its different uses), should be betterdescribed. The experiments have been performed in different conditions. Is it correct to put all the results together? | The general/specific aspects of MetaVals have been further discussed. |
| C | Also the originality of the article and the contributed advancement over the state of the art should be stated. What are the future works enabled by the present paper? Beside Level of certainty, are there other generalindicators/tools that could be used in order to support collaboration in SGs? | The interest of collaborative GBL has been discussed going further the LC support.  |
| C | The English language is good, but should be carefully checked. The IJSG formatting rules must be carefully followed. | IJSG formatting has been applied. |