

We thank the reviewers for their insightful comments, and we have updated our draft accordingly. Specifically, we have made the following changes:

- We add a (very) brief discussion of state-of-the-art approaches to evaluating chatbot response quality as suggested by Reviewer ik8M11; due to space constraints in the short paper format, we are not able to provide a full survey.
- We appreciate the recommendation from Reviewer XGai12 to explore the relationship between our approach and query expansion, and have added it to our plan for future work.
- We have fixed the typo noted and clarified the coloring of the figure in the caption as suggested by Reviewer XGai12.

We also would like to offer the following clarifications/points of discussion:

- In response to Reviewer ik8M11's question of how we measure bias, we would like to clarify that we are measuring bias as the extent to which chatbot response quality varies based on the identity or dialect of the prompter. We would interpret a statistically significant disparity in one or more quality metrics across groups as an indicator of potential bias.
- Reviewer XGai12 asks whether empirical evidence supports the idea that educators will be able to restate any prompt given only one piece of seed text written by students, or whether different/more seed text may be needed in order to generalize across subjects. This is an excellent question - so far, the seed text that we have used has not been related to the topics of the prompts we have sought to restate, and we have found that the same seed text has been a useful reference point for restating prompts across a variety of topics *when the seed text is provided in the system instructions*. When we have tried to use seed text as an input to fine-tuning, however, we have seen that one student essay is not sufficient to conduct fine-tuning, and more content would be needed.

In closing, we would like to thank the reviewers again for their thoughtful and supportive comments, which will be invaluable to us as we conduct the research study outlined in this short paper.