

IAT 804 Review Response Examples

Response to Reviews TEI 2019

* Clarified contribution to be focus on socio-technological processes impacting intervention group; addressed methodological questions about control group (yes, the later did the intervention, not reported here for space reasons); linked to 2019 CHI paper that does report findings for control group.

* Refined discussion to acknowledge limitation of small sample size and non-blind raters

* Added specifics of findings to Abstract

* Minor changes noted in reviewers.

* Also emailed the coordinator of this paper the following re request to add four new tables, which was deemed an acceptable response. "The minor recommendation from R1 who would like a table for each mixed ANOVA result is not easily achieved. Adding 4 tables, presumably in addition to discussing results in the text where the context of the statistics is explained, would add at minimum 1/2 a page and would duplicate information. I've used the APA standard form for reporting the mixed ANOVA results in the text so they should be clear and if not, it is easy to google look up how to read them. I don't think adding tables is necessary in an 8 page paper. Since this is a minor comment, as is spelling out all abbreviations, I will decline to make those changes."

REVISION REPORT

Thank you kindly for all the thoughtful comments and support for this paper throughout the review process. We have addressed the reviewers' comments and followed through on our proposed changes we outlined in the rebuttal, particularly focusing on the following areas:

1. Clarifying the methodology and relation to phenomenology.

In the methodology section, we added a couple of sentences on how phenomenology has been and can be used both as a theoretical stance and as a research approach in HCI, and why we chose phenomenology over other qualitative approaches. We included key references, including those provided by the reviewers, in particular referring back to Moustakas' and Giorgi's "psychological phenomenology" rather than solely referencing Crewell's description.

2. Checking some of the claims made and clarifying if they are based on data and observation or other evidence.

We softened our claims and stated that our findings provide a new lens through lucid dreaming to view designing for positive virtual reality experiences. We also rephrased claims of well-being, liberation, and discovering life's secrets to more clearly show when conclusions are drawn from the participants themselves and which are from the authors. For example, we stated that participants find lucid dreaming feels very tranquil, blissful and pleasant experience; there is a chance to explore one's thoughts and feelings, and uncover 'secret knowledge' known only to that individual.

3. Strengthening the implications to move beyond obvious recommendations, perhaps by forging connections with current and ongoing VR work, speculating about future directions, and/or drawing out broader insights directly tied to the user study.

We created subheadings of "corroborated results" and "nuanced insights" in the design implications section and included the references of the corroborated results kindly suggested by the reviewers to better clarify the novel implications and the nuanced ones already proposed by prior VR literature. We see the main novel implications being ceremony and personal meaning making.

4. Clarifying relationship to prior lucid dreaming work.

We clarified the definition of lucid dreaming on two accounts in the introduction and results, respectively: first, LaBerg & Verifield (1990) and LeBerge (2014) defined lucid dreaming as "knowing you are in a dream while dreaming"; second, our participants described lucid dreaming in this manner too. We also emphasized the design considerations coming out of our study to more clearly show the tie between lucid dreaming research to technology design.