**Reviewer #1**  
This is a well-structured article with clear findings, The focus on the linguistic features that characterise specific moves and steps should be of some value to EAP syllabus and materials designers.  
  
My suggestions for improvement are outlined below.  
  
1.- To make it possible to replicate the study, it would be useful to provide more detail, in the data and method section, of the procedures for separating introductions from the body of the lecture. On page 7 it says that boundary markers were used as cues to separate the introduction from the body. Only three such markers are given as examples (OK, allright, now). It would be good to provide a full list of those serving this purpose in the dataset. On page 18 the identification procedure is referred to again, but this time the emphasis seems to be on semantic criteria, with introductions being assumed to have ended once the lecturer had announced the topic and provided some contextualisation.  
It’s not clear whether the introduction section was considered to have ended as soon as one of these markers was uttered for the first time, or whether it was only considered to have ended after the topic announcement and contextualisation. Clearly, it is possible for a lecture to begin with a boundary marker and/or a topic announcement, before any of the other introductory moves. Presumably initial markers were discounted – but what if another introductory move followed a boundary marker and/or a topic announcement later on? Or if a piece of new information was inserted between introductory moves? These sorts of problems should be acknowledged and discussed with reference to more extended examples from the dataset. “Analysis criteria” are referred to on page 7 - if these criteria were established, as is claimed, it should be possible to make them more explicit. It is not satisfactory to argue that introductions can be easily recognised by a researcher who is familiar with “the previously established models” (page 18), because this approach does not allow for possible problems with previous claims, and is likely to result in researchers discarding evidence which does not fit the models.

**Authors’ response: In the Data and method section, more details of the procedures for separating introductions from the body of the lecture were provided (pp. 8-10). A full list of boundary** **markers, as well as initiating discourse markers and constructions semantically indicating the beginning of the central part of the lecture, was provided (p. 9). Analysis criteria were made more explicit (pp. 8-10).**

2.- The size of the dataset and the average length of the introductions should also be stated, in words and possibly minutes and seconds. This could be informative when teaching learners to listen out for some of the moves identified in the paper. It would also be very helpful to know what proportion of the entire lecture was usually taken up by the introduction section.

**Authors’ response: In the Data and method section, the size of the dataset and the average length of the introductions in words and minutes and seconds were also stated (p. 8, paragraph 1).**

3.- The references to Dubois (1980) and Listener Orientation convey a rather confusing picture. On page 6 we are told that Yaakob (2013) introduced the idea of Listener Orientation, following Dubois, but then on page 8 we are told that Listener Orientation, following Dubois, was identified by Thompson (1994). On page 9 we learn that Thompson did not include Listener Orientation elements in her final model, while on the other hand Yaakob (2013) did include Listener Orientation. Altogether the first part of the first paragraph on page 9 is difficult to follow – I wasn’t sure what was being referred to by the “additional moves to the two main ones”. It would be so much easier for the reader if this part was reworded, and if Thompson (1994) was either mentioned before Yaakob (2013) in relation to Listener Orientation, or if Thompson’s role was not mentioned at all, since she did not actually incorporate this orientation into her model.

**Authors’ response: The suggestion was adopted (p. 13). The construction “additional moves to the two main ones” was made more understandable by specifying “what the two main ones” were. The part referring to Thompson was erased, as suggested.**   
  
4.- I wasn’t sure why information on upcoming tests should be considered “technical information”, but this is just a question of labelling, and not a serious issue.

**Authors’ response: We erased the word ‘technical’ preceding the word information referring to upcoming tests.**

5.-On page 15 it is claimed that in the prior literature only Yaakob (2013) mentions references to future lectures. This is not quite correct, as Alsop & Nesi (2013, 2014 and 2015) also describe this feature.
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**Authors’ response: As for references to future lectures, Alsop & Nesi (2013, 2014 and 2015) were also added (p. 19 and p. 23-24).**  
Corrections  
Page 3  
“Four genre analysis” should be “analyses”  
**Authors’ response: The suggestion was adopted (p. 2).**

Page 4  
“Swalesean model / approach” Should be “The Swalesean model / approach”  
“Swalesean approach was less applied…” should be “the Swalesean approach has been applied less frequently …”  
“However, these studies show that rhetorical move analysis has proved to be a successful framework” should be “However, these studies show that rhetorical move analysis is a successful framework”

**Authors’ response: The suggestion was adopted (p. 4).**

Page 5  
“it is very significant to get familiarized with the lecture introductions organization and its purpose”. Reword as “it is very important for them to become familiar with the organization and purpose of lecture introductions”.

**Authors’ response: The suggestion was adopted (p. 5).**

Page 6  
“The content orientation comprises Thompson’s both functions” – reword as “The content orientation realizes Thompson’s two functions”

**Authors’ response: The suggestion was adopted (p. 6).**  
Page 18  
“which almost always present (98%)” should be “which is almost always present (98%)”  
“This is usually straightforward to recognized by a researcher familiarized with the previously established models”. Reword as “This is usually easily recognized by a researcher who is familiar with the previously established models”.

**Authors’ response: The constructions were corrected (p. 22, paragraph 1).**

**Reviewer #2**  
1.- The abstract written in Spanish shows some major problems of formal academic writing. Translation is deficient; therefore, it needs to be reviewed as well as the title, the explanation of the corpus and the methodology (e.g. 'El corpus más largo'). The title in English has redundant punctuation.

**Authors’ response: The translation of the abstract was reviewed. The colon from the title in English was removed.**

2.- The second goal should be revised. I suggest to use the verb “to compare” or “to validate”.

**Authors’ response: The suggestion was adopted and the word “compare” was used (p. 1).**  
3.- The introduction needs to be restructured as there is disorganization in the writing. There is no clear structure in the paragraphs; some are too long and others are too short such as the last paragraph. It makes it difficult to have an effective closure for this section.

**Authors’ response: The introduction was reorganised and reworded for clarity and to allow an easier following of the argument. The goals of the study were also made clearer.**

4.- It is problematic to talk about structure and structural organization using Swales’ theoretical framework. It is necessary to reevaluate this because the rhetorical units are always functional units, in words of Swales. In this sense, it would be more appropriated to talk about functional organization. It is also important to reexamine the notion of text type as it has important differences with discursive genre from this perspective.

**Authors’ response: The suggestion was adopted. The notion *functional organization* was introduced throughout the article instead of the notion *structural organization* (changes are given in yellow). The notion of *text type* was made more specific by adding “spoken and written” in front of it (p. 4, the last paragraph).**

5.- Methodology is poorly described. Method of analysis and methodological elements should be written in detail. It is not clear what type of genre analysis is used and the consequences of choosing between one or another model of analysis (eg. BCU: Upton & Cohen, 2009 or more inductive analysis).

**Authors’ response: The method was described through a procedure which involved several steps. It now offers much more information, in a way which is easy to follow, corresponding to Upton and Cohen's model (2009) (p. 11).** 

6.- The corpus needs more contextualization, for example how it was collected. All the speakers are native English speakers. What advantage does this corpus have over MICASE?

**Authors’ response: More contextualization on the corpora was provided, and advantages that this corpus has over MICASE were stated (p. 7, paragraphs 1 and 2 in the Data and method section).**

7.- The conclusion does not contain an effective closure for the article. It seems the research is incomplete, with no projections and emphasis of its importance, as well as an evaluation of it. It only summarizes the process.

**Authors’ response:** **The conclusion was reorganized and reworded so as to highlight better the results of the study and be more effective.**