

Geosci. Commun. Discuss., author comment AC3  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-37-AC3>, 2022  
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## Reply on RC3

Jessica H. Pugsley et al.

---

Author comment on "Virtual field trips utilizing virtual outcrop: construction, delivery and implications for the future" by Jessica H. Pugsley et al., Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-37-AC3>, 2022

---

Thank you for your detailed review. We are pleased you found our manuscript needing "minor revisions", and that it has a lot of potential and is not far from being a strong contribution. We agree a clearer focus on the use of virtual outcrop (VO) within VFTs would benefit this contribution and will make appropriate changes to reflect this. The intention of this contribution was to present a novel and timely case study of a Virtual Field Trip (VFT) using virtual outcrop. Our primary purpose was to provide a workflow for the VFTs, and some comparison to traditional fieldtrips.

Reviews 1, 2 and 4 also request additional detail of how we designed the VFTs around the learning outcomes. We agree that we can expand and modify Section 2 to accommodate this suggestion, while retaining our course evaluations, with mention of the flaws of self-reporting. The other reviewers also highlighted that our conclusions are overly broad or in areas unclear as to how they fully relate to the main text. We will clarify and refine our conclusions and incorporate a stronger statement, as you recommend. We intend to compare this VFT case study and findings to the fundamental VFT research literature you describe within the discussion.

The section you highlight within the end of introduction will be moved, and slightly adapted earlier within the text.

Sections 3.1 and 3.2 will be shortened and compiled to reduce the amount of repetition, although some of this data such as WiFi Speeds, students' location (off or on campus) we intend to keep as part of the "important info" you describe.

Section 5.2 was intended to provide geological context, however, reviewer 4 also suggests that the section is inessential to this contribution's narrative. We intend to shorten and modify.

Again, we thank you for your review, which we are certain will help strengthen this contribution.

On behalf of authors, Jessica Pugsley ([jessica.pugsley@abdn.ac.uk](mailto:jessica.pugsley@abdn.ac.uk))