

Review comment-1

It seems as if this is little more than a brief write up of the authors' experience conducting two workshops.

At 43 words, the title is much too long. The article rambles at times, is poorly formatted, and the tense is often inconsistent.

They are appropriate to the article, assuming that all citations are included in the reference page.

Specific Comments:

This manuscript is poorly written, poorly organized, rambles, and is poorly formatted. The authors seem to have copied and pasted the slides and outlines from their PPT presentations into the article but did not provide very much context for them as was reasonably expected on p. 7, immediately before Figure 3. A simple overview of each of the two presentations would have been sufficient. In the section "Description of how presenters used the handout materials in the workshops," the authors provide excessive detail about seemingly minor points, which wastes the readers' time and detracts from more important points that the authors may have wanted to convey but did not. In the section "Discussion of our concluding thoughts," I expected the authors to discuss broader implications of their experiences and what others can learn from it, but they chose not to, instead focusing solely on their experiences. Given these concerns, I do not think the article is appropriate for this publication. While the authors' intent may be good, this article should only be considered if the authors rewrite the entire article, including the title, abstract, and all sections of the article. The article should also include implications for others interested in offering similar workshops and be able to answer the question, "If I want to do something similar, what can I learn from your experience?"