



Comment on gc-2021-21

Anna Hicks (Referee)

Referee comment on "Interactive virtual fieldtrip as a tool for remote education" by Niki Evelpidou et al., Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-21-RC2>, 2021

General comments

I do not believe there is not enough original content in this paper for it to be published. The lead author has self-cited throughout and has included much of their own work in Section 3 that is far too detailed and irrelevant for the paper. The authors have already published the results of a similar survey (likely conducted simultaneously as the cohort is the same) in the same Geoscience Communication special issue "Virtual field trips as a tool for indirect geomorphological experience: a case study from the southeastern part of the Gulf of Corinth, Greece". In my opinion, the results presented here should have been included in that publication.

I agree with the points Mohadjer has raised, and, if the authors wish to publish these results, I encourage them to develop this paper considerably in light of the comments below and the suggestions raised by Mohadjer.

Specific comments

24 This is supposition – do you mean field trips can support the classroom-taught principles? I wouldn't say they allow students to understand concepts in any certain terms.

40 I'm not convinced this example of the challenges of Greek educators visiting another location is particularly relevant. It's obvious that actual fieldtrips require transportation, time, and resources, it's not necessary to add a weak example.

45 I think you can be satisfied the reader will know what weather conditions are – no need to add examples.

49 Careful with your use of 'paramount significance' here! Is it really? Do you present the evidence?

67 I'm confused about your approach and thinking here. Are you testing a hypothesis that virtual field trips are useful supplements but not substitutes to actual field trips? You seem to be suggesting here that you know this already....so why study it?

82 84 of the whole cohort of students completed the questionnaire? Or 84 of the 134 third year students? Created for what purpose? Please add some more information here. What were you asking the students?

132-133 It is useful to know the reasons why the region was chosen, such as you have done here. Much of the detail in Section 3 is superfluous, and unless it is directly relevant to the aims of the study, I'd advise removing much of it, or explaining why the detail is important to include in this particular paper.

Figure 5 Is very poor quality.

I'm afraid I stopped reviewing at this point as the discussion and conclusions are not original contributions to research (see general comments).

Technical comments

- Be consistent with your use of fieldtrip or field trip, fieldwork or field work.

7 I'd advise changing the word prosecution throughout the manuscript. It has two meanings in English.

12 Be consistent throughout with your use of live, real or actual field trip. I would recommend actual.

28 I suggest moving this sentence before the previous and slightly developing the sentence which you provide a reference by Clark. Are you talking here about the power of field trips as shared experiences? If so, please provide a little more information.

31 Advise using students or participants instead of 'attendants'

47 Can be not they are

48 some not most

81 to not at

104 no need to tell us which programme you used to created your map