EVALUATION FORM

5: Totally accomplished
4: Highly accomplished
3: Sufficiently accomplished
2: Poorly accomplished
1: Not accomplished at all
*: Not applicable

SPECIFIC EVALUATION OF THE PAPER	ACCOMPLISHED….						COMMENTS
	Totally	Highly	Sufficiently	Poorly	Not accomplished at all	Not applicable	
FOUNDATIONS/BACKGROUND/THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK							
1. Research problem is properly defined and objectives of the study are will planned, clear and concisely *Thank you for this correct comment! We have changed the hypotheses accordingly.*	5	4 X	3	2	1	*	Hypothesis 3 and 4 look somehow confusing to me. Maybe they could be simplified by removing *"and closeness centrality"* from both of them.
2. Variables and dimensions of study are adequately identified, and conceptual and/or empirically defined	5 X	4	3	2	1	*	
3. Literature review is enough and the information provided about the topic is updated	5 X	4	3	2	1	*	
4. Literature review is clearly related with the problem or main topic of the paper	5 X	4	3	2	1	*	
METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN (Tools and methods)							
5. The design includes a detailed description of the data collection methodology: sample, procedure, tools, instructions, registration method, etc. *We have added considerable information on closeness centrality in the 'Analysis' section, see also comment below.*	5	4 X	3	2	1	*	A well-addressed design, the research process is clearly reported. It might be necessary some more details about the criteria used to measure and normalize closeness centrality (see comment to item 8)
6. Methodology has quality issues (validity and reliability)	5	4	3	2	1 X	*	Inverse item, no issues
7. Sample size or informants are adequate and guarantee the presence of an acceptable part of the population	5 X	4	3	2	1	*	
8. Variables or dimensions are adequately operational	5	4	3 X	2	1	*	The way in which social network variables were operationally defined and normalized seems really interesting to me. No problem with degree centrality at all, but I have missed some

						information about the criteria used to measure closeness centrality in the Instruments and/or Analysis sections. If possible, It might be useful to add some more details about how "shorter or longer paths" were identified.
9. Sample selection process is appropriate and is sufficiently described	5 X	4	3	2	1	*	
10. Data analysis is appropriate to the source and nature of the study	5 X	4	3	2	1	*	
11. Conclusions are justified and supported on the evidence of the findings (results)	5 X	4	3	2	1	*	
12. Results are adequately discussed, relating study results with those obtained in previous studies by other authors Thank you! This has been modified.	5 X	4	3	2	1	*	Typo in the Regression section (p. 11)? *"Results replicated our correlational analyses, suggesting that out-closeness centrality was found to be related to organizational commitment (β = .22, p < .05) above a negative effect of experience at school (β = -.21, p < .05)."* Should this Beta value be β = -.23?
13. Authors make critical comments about limitations of the study and offer new proposals and future research topics	5 X	4	3	2	1	*	
FORMAL ASPECTS							
14. The structure of the document corresponds to a scientific paper	5 X	4	3	2	1	*	
15. The title reflects clear and concisely the content of the paper	5 X	4	3	2	1		
16. The document presented is not very extensive, it is sufficiently condensed	5 X	4	3	2	1	*	
17. The abstract is properly written, according to PSRI guidelines Thank you! This has been modified as well. As it is the abstract, we only have included a short sentence on these findings.	5 X	4	3	2	1	*	Only as suggestion: Might the sentence *"No significant results were found for the relationship between teachers' social network indicators and teacher commitment"* be revised? Maybe it could be interesting to briefly mention the findings from regression analysis about closeness centrality and commitment to students, as well as commitment to organization.
18. Style and writing are clear, readable and concise Thank you! This has been modified.	5 X	4	3	2	1	*	Typo in p. 5 *... we will now continu to argue...*

						Typo in p. 6: ...(Liou et al., 2014). .Social support...
19. Tables and/or figures are self-explanatory and don't repeat the same information available in the text (there are no redundancy problems) Thank you! We have added a description of these findings as well, in the Results section.	5	4 X	3	2	1	*	Maybe a little bit of redundancy found regarding table 3. In the text, *Degree-centrality* descriptive statistics are well described, but *closeness-centrality* ones are missed.
20. References are complete, updated and follow international APA 6th edition guidelines (www.apastyle.org)	5 X	4	3	2	1	*	

On behalf of my co-authors, I would like to thank you and the anonymous reviewer(s) for these valuable comments.

Best wishes,

Nienke Moolenaar