Dear Editor,

We would like to thank you and your reviewers for your constructive feedbacks. We have revised the paper and highlighted any change in the text to facilitate the revision procedure. Our responses (highlighted with turquoise color in the text) to the Reviewer A’s comments are outlined as follows:

**1.  However, I still believe that it would be beneficial (both for the authors and for the readers) to describe at least one part of the teaching intervention, as suggested both the Reviewer A and Reviewer B. For example, the authors could explain analogy used in the experimental group, and how this particular analogy provide opportunity for the pre-service teachers to deal with e.g. alternative conception 5 („Gases cannot be compressed. They move the top of the container in the form of droplets“). This change would require only a few rows extra in the manuscript. Namely, my recommendation is not to include the whole Appendix 2. A sample teaching design for the experimental group, but to describe one example.**

We added the following explanation to give some insights about the analogy we had used:

For example, a ‘sumo wrestler’ analogy was used to make the relationship between the temperature and volume of a fixed quantity of gas familiar. Later, the participants were asked to compare analogue feature (i.e., sumo wrestling ring) with target one (e.g., Charles gas law, and particulate nature of matter) via analogy mapping.

**2. Also, the appropriate reference about two-tier tests should be noted (i.e. the reference which led the authors to use this instrument in their study).**

We explicitly depicted and added two references (20-21) used in the text by taking the limitation of the references in the journal into account.

**3. typing errors: Appendix 5. Sample questions for the science process skills test, Question 28. „These beakers were heated with...“ and Introduction, page 2, cite as conceptual change methods/techniques,3,7,12,14-17.**

We corrected these typing errors.