• While the authors didn’t really explain the reasons this research area is relevant, the reason for the exploring this area intuitive. To rationalize the area of exploration, the introduction is well cited with relevant research.

• The authors’ concern with off-task areas and its possible impact on the behavior of children and the effectiveness of narrative-driven is well articulated.

• It’s confusing as to what constitutes on-task areas and what’s off-task. For instance, the beach was described as being a part of the narrative—something which to our reading should constitute part of the task within the learning environment—however, it had a negative correlation with test-performance. This leads into our concerns with biases in classification.

• Multiple people were not involved in the classification of the areas as either on-task or off-task, leading biases that resulted in the misclassification of areas in the environment. The misclassification of one of the locations may have led to biases, as it was used in the correlation.

• Additionally, splitting the areas into more than just two categories—off-task and on-task—to perhaps more varied classification—such as off-task, narrative, and curriculum based. At this point, they could use more sophisticated analysis.

• There were many performance tests which were mentioned: the students performed a battery a week before participating. However, these were given a cursory mention; they were never expounded upon. In a similar fashion, it was mentioned that a control group was given PowerPoint slides, however, this was never explained.

• Previous criticism aside, the data presented is clear and supports their claims. However, the biases noted would impact the findings. It is worth noting this is an exploratory study. Further work that is a result of the findings in this paper may be more appropriate for our collection.

• While they don’t narrow the field, there are some new findings and questions which are raised. The authors clearly articulate guidelines for further work and describe which areas may be of interest. The paper is not meant to educate the reader on a specific area—focusing the field—rather, it reveals a possible area of interest. The paper could be improved upon by providing some actionable measures which could be used by people in the field to improve current systems.

• For a non-expert reader, it’s well written. It clearly describes a possible issue with narrative-based games: that user’s will inevitably spend time not-focused on the tasks they’re performing. However, when you start to look at the specifics of the experiments performed and their methodology confusion arises due to vague writing and poor explanation.

Weak reject on the basis that there are later papers which more adequately describe the phenomena.