

This is potentially a useful article. Unfortunately, it looks as though the author has rushed their submission. It needs a lot of straightforward tidying up by the author before a revised version is resubmitted.

Specific feedback:

1. Title is a bit unexciting - ? something like 'The value of short Earth Science CPD for trainee primary school teachers'.
2. Line 31. Not clear whether "but the primary teachers' programme has only recently been examined" refers to another study (in which case it should be referenced) or this study (in which case 'only recently is unnecessary and confusing).
3. Terms that may not be familiar to a non-English audience need explaining – e.g. 'Ofsted', 'Teach First', 'PGCE' and 'BAEd.'. Similarly, phrases like 'non-science primary teachers' (lines 57-58) may not be understood by someone outside England.
4. Don't use phrases like 'my county' – stipulate 'England' or 'the UK' as appropriate.
5. Guskey is introduced without any explanation.
6. There seems to be no mention of ethical issues.
7. Some passages look to have been inappropriately copied and pasted from a PhD thesis – e.g. 'these data have been used for the purposes of this thesis' (lines 112-113 – and similarly in the next two bullet points).
8. Some passages have not been well proof-read / laid out, e.g. in table 1 we have 'no. of males in study' instead of 'No. of males in study', 'totals' is in the wrong position and there is no need for the three occasions when a terminal zero is used in the percentages.
9. I don't think Table 3 is needed, given Table 4.
10. Figure 2 is clearly the wrong Figure and does not look to merit inclusion.
11. Figure 3 is what is referred to in the text as Figure 2.
12. The references need quite a bit of tidying up.