

Introduction

- We feel that the concept of narrative learning environments is not clearly described for a non-expert reader. We acknowledge the fact that the authors key elements of NLEs and convey their prevalence in the literature with numerous citations, but their definition of a narrative learning environment is under-developed.
- Our group all drew differing conclusions about the intention, motivation and research questions in the paper. Though the authors are clear about their aim to examine off-task behaviour in NLEs, and to look for possible relationships between student performance in differing versions of Crystal Island, it is unclear if they aim to provide a mere overview or if they begin with a hypothesis they wish to test.

Methodology

- There are some good points made in the description of their research methodology. They did a good job explaining the shortcomings of simply observing participants -- that it is not a good way of estimating whether a student is engaged with 'on-task' behaviour.
- We feel that pre-experiment and post-experiment materials are not adequately described for non-expert readers. They do provide references towards e.g. tests used but they do not explain why these tests were chosen.
- We are happy with the authors' explanation of the experiment's setting and participant groups, and we feel this is easy to understand.
- The authors make a very big assumption as their base definition for metrics of "off-task behaviour" -- "only behaviors that are clearly unrelated to the narrative and curriculum are denoted as off-task". This is done using an analysis of the locations students visit within Crystal Island ("path analysis"). We feel that such a conservative definition may lead to many false positives and uncertain conclusions, and the definition employed isn't adequately justified.

Results and Interpretation

- We found the presentation of their data particularly confusing for non-expert readers. Data is tabulated without explicit mention of what it actually means, and the discussion thereafter brings in new points of discussion (e.g. a notion of 'student enjoyment') without explicit reference to how these were measured.
- This paper could easily be improved by, for example, strengthening the discussion of the results of the path analysis graph. They could also provide more explicit discussion of the meaning associated with the correlations of student performance with Crystal Island locations.

We conclude with a **neutral** of this paper as we feel that concepts are confusing or under-detailed, but would be greatly improved by small adjustments.