Thank you for your feedback on paper 89-373-1: **Video Game Self-efficacy and its Effect on Training Performance.** We are extremely happy to be given the opportunity to revise our paper so that we can add to our ideas and clarify any confusion present within the paper. The following changes have been made to the paper:

**Reviewer 1:**

1. Very good paper recommended for publication

**Thank you for the kind words. They are much appreciated.**

**Reviewer 2:**

1. The paper is well written and interesting. It provides insights that would  
   be useful for the IJSG readership. The major issue I see, and I would ask  
   the authors to address, is that it is difficult to relate the positive  
   experimental results with specific elements in the game design, while the  
   readers would be very interesting in understanding how their game design  
   could allow achieving the positive training results presented in this paper.

**This is a very good point. Thank you for pointing this out. Unfortunately, we were not able to design the game since we use one already created by Cubic. Therefore, we chose to focus our study more on the game-based outcomes vs. the text-based outcomes and the moderators involved. We do agree that the game having scaffolding in its level design could help allow for the positive training outcomes. We also believe that the participants in the game-based condition have an opportunity to engage in experiential/active learning and spending more time with the training materials could also contribute to the training outcomes. We have updated sub-section 6.1 to include these ideas in the appropriate spots.**

1. Section 2 is a bit lengthy and may be reduced.

**Thank you for this suggestion. Any redundant language and/or paragraphs have been removed from section 2 to reduce the length.**

1. The experiment provides positive results about the effectiveness of the game. For this reason, I would love reading some more details about the game (including some snapshots, possibly), the user interaction it supports and what game features may explain a positive evaluation.

**We've expanded on the explanation of the game in sub-section 4.2 to include more detail. No screen shots of the game are available at this time.**

1. Is the used game representative of (a category of) serious games? Could results be extended to (at least a category of) serious games.

**Thank you for bringing this up. We agree that the used game could be categorized as a serious game for the military and this could help the results generalize to that genre of games. However, we believe the limitations dealing with population used would still hold true. Sub-section 6.2 was edited to include this.**

1. I would also like to better know the “high-fidelity” task test.

**The task is described in sub-section 4.3. Thank you for pointing out that this was not apparent when the "high-fidelity" task was mentioned in subsection 6.1. Both Subsection 4.3 and 6.1 had text added to clarify this.**

1. Numbers should be reported together, possibly.

**Thank you for this suggestion. We believe the numbers reported the way they were helps make it easier to follow the results in order as they relate to the hypotheses of the study.**

1. How many participants answered the follow-up quiz?

**Thank you for pointing out our oversight to include this. The number of participants who responded to the follow-up quiz (29) was added to the beginning of section 5.**

1. Please specify IV and DV (indep and dep variable).

**Called the IV and DVs out where appropriate in section 4.**

1. I am not sure about the last statements on page 12. I would say that user self-efficacy in videogames is already established and independent of this last game. Also, the subsequent statement puts as a research goal the understanding of how to increase game self-efficacy during training.

**We agree. We did not mean to suggest that it wasn't. We were trying to point some potential consequences of the findings. Thank you for pointing out this lack of clarity. We updated the language at the end of page 12 to clarify.**

1. 6.1 “discussion” could spin off a “limitations” sub-section.

**Incorporated a limitation sub-section.**

1. Two sub-sections are numbered 6.1.

**Thank you for catching this error. Changed the number of the sub-section to be accurate.**

1. Bibliography is rich. However, concerning in-game user assessment, recent papers by Bellotti, De Gloria, Moreno-Ger, Boyle, Van Oostendorp, etc. could be considered.

**Thank you for this suggestion. The study does not utilize in-game user assessments so we believe the papers suggested to beyond the scope of this paper.**