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. We did not intend to present the benefits of VFTs in general, though instead document the findings of this specific case study. However, it is apparent that this was not fully clear, and our contribution requires some modification to rectify this.

Thank you for your detailed review and clear consideration of other reviewer comments. We agree that our conclusions are overly broad and intend to refine to ensure they cover the contents of the main script. We will also expand/modify our learning goal section to accommodate more detail on our learning outcomes and VFT process, while retaining our course evaluations, with mention of the flaws of self-reporting. We also intend to slightly modify the scope of this contribution to focus on the use of virtual outcrop (VO) within VFTs, as suggested by reviewer 3. Reviews 1, 2 and 3 also request additional detail of how we designed the VFTs around the learning outcomes.

We do not intend to define a VFT, but instead aim to offer a clear example of VFTs using VO, specifically a VFT within LIME, and how such VFTs were designed, delivered, and evaluated. Within the introduction lines 65 – 77 we discuss forms of VFT.

While we agree that many “activities” listed also take place during lectures, many of these activities also occur on traditional fieldtrips (groupwork, independent work exploring an outcrop, discussion and illustrated explanation by staff member… and more). The overlap between lectures and VFTs is highly dependent on workgroup and resources. Within this contribution we refer to a VFT as a direct virtual replacement of a fieldtrip, with the same learning objectives as the traditional fieldtrips, with many of the same locations, however we acknowledge that the term VFT is used in a wide variety of ways.
We intend to compare this VFT case study and findings other VFT research literature (many listed by reviewer 1) within the discussion. We will also discuss the material volume and our evaluation of it, as you highlight, this is an interesting point.

Reviewer 3 also agreed that section 5.1 may not add to this contribution, which we therefore intend to shorten as to not detract from the overall narrative, as you describe.

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),