

This manuscript is important to the scientific community in that it creates dialogue surrounding the 7-8 week course model and implications for promotion of critical thinking in this setting.

The article speaks less about the role of the evaluator and more about what one gains from the evaluator role. To that end, perhaps a title “Fostering Connection and Engagement through Peer Review Efforts in Asynchronous Research Courses”

The abstract was comprehensive.

The manuscript flowed well with the exception of the two sentences noted in above.

References are appropriate and up to date.

Specific Comments:

Edit the following statements clarity and conciseness:

“All identifiers were removed from the narratives by the professor with access to original posts, were randomized, and distributed to three researchers.”

“Only engaged learning was established prior to the independent review with the others developed using inductive category development through analysis and immersion in the narratives.”