Reviewer #1:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer’s comments** | **Authors’ response** |
| Given the journal’s focus it would be worthwhile emphasising education / schools more clearly in the introduction to frame the article for the likely audience | A discussion about the concept of ‘education’ underlying the project and the paper is included in pages 2-3. |
| It would further enhance the paper to be more explicit about how these findings and practices could be translated or made relevant to other contexts. | A “Discussion” section was added, and some of these concerns were also included in the “Closing remarks” (pages 18-19). |
| It would also be useful to define some of the terms being used such as endogenous and exogenous as the audience may not be familiar with them. | Included in page 3. |

Reviewer #2:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer’s comments** | **Authors’ response** |
| Considering that it is only over 3,000 words, there is plenty of space to develop a discussion section in between the presentation of case studies and the closing remarks that would strongly connect the dots for the readers | A “Discussion” section was added, spanning from pages 14 to 18. |
| In the introduction, the fieldwork process was detailed, yet in relation to the context of this paper, schools were not listed as agencies contacted by team members. It seemed odd that this was not stated. | Although schools are not explicitly named, they are included when referring to “formal and informal local development initiatives in the rural context (…) in diverse areas: arts, culture, citizenship, heritage, sports, intergenerational activities, education (…)”. Additionally, a discussion about the concept of ‘education’ underlying the project and the paper is included in pages 2-3. In the “Methodology” section, schools are listed as follows: “Fieldwork was undertook by a team of senior technicians working with either ICE or ANIMAR, who contacted representatives of local development associations, schools, social solidarity private institutions (IPSS), local councils for social action (CLAS), cooperatives, mutualistic associations, local governments (civil parish governments and city councils), as well as other relevant actors engaging in local development processes in their territories” (p. 9). |
| In the methodology section, I would suggest reorganizing so that the last paragraph, which details the methodological origins of the study, is earlier in the section, thus identifying the literature (citations) before providing an example of the participatory methods used by the researchers. | Done on page 8. |
| In the section “rural schools and local development,” I believe the addition of citations for the paragraph on community development would be helpful in situating the discussion section as well as providing readers with resources if they are interested in further pursuing this topic on their own. (paragraph beginning “these initiatives”). | References were added to frame the presentation of the case studies (pages 10-12). |
| The description of the different case studies was beautifully written, but I think a stronger connection with the conceptual framework would be useful. I would suggest reorganizing the examples in this section to make the reasons why they are considered exemplary practices more clear. The last paragraph in this section reiterates the conceptual framework components, but this could be filtered in through the descriptions of the case studies and thus amplified. | Information on the criteria used to select the initiatives in included on page 7. Further information about the relevance of the eight case studies is included on page 10. |
| In the closing remarks section, the idea that this project can “fuel the debate” around education and development and democratic citizenship, is really powerful. I think the discussion could centre around this topic, and bringing in citations on participatory democracy or community-based education (for example) could strengthen this claim and make clear the contributions of the study to the field of rural education research. | A “Discussion” section was added, spanning from pages 14 to 18. The “Closing remarks” section was also expanded. |
| In addition, the last paragraph is great, but tying the remarks back to specific components of the project would make a stronger ending. For example, perhaps how this project is being used or will be used by the government or development agencies or local communities moving forward? Or how it directs us to consider further research, either methodologically (the tertúlias) or linking policy-practice or expanding development outside of economic frameworks (as was mentioned in the introduction)? | Two paragraphs were added to the “Closing remarks” section, seeking to expand on the impact of the project (namely, limitations and policy-making). |