December 1, 2022

Prof. Steven Whitmeyer  
Editor  
Geoscience Communication

Dr. Solmaz Mohadjer  
Executive Editor  
Geoscience Communication

Dear Professor Whitmeyer and Dr. Mohadjer,

Thank you for your comments on my last revision of my submitted manuscript to the special issue on Virtual Geoscience Education Resources in Geoscience Communication. I am pleased to present to you, as enclosed, a further revised manuscript and accompanying documents for the manuscript number GC-2021-18-R2, titled “Transformation of geological sciences and geological engineering field methods course to remote delivery using manual, virtual, and blended tools in fall 2020”.

The changes made to the R1 manuscript are indicated with red coloured font in the marked-up version. To address the review comments individually, your comments are provided below in italicized font and followed immediately by a response. In addition, a clean R2 manuscript that incorporates all updates is also provided, which I hope you will find ready for publication.

COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHOR:

(1) I think showing one photo as an example in Figure 1 would suffice.  
I respectfully disagree because all three photos show the diversity of geologies covered during in-person field trips in this course. I have added more details to the figure caption to emphasize the geological diversity (Line 120-121).

(2) What is the question shown in Figure 5? Please add it to the figure caption.  
The figure caption has been edited to improve clarity (Line 236).

(3) What are the numbers and “x” in Table 4? Please add to the caption.  
They were used to indicate single instances of CLOs. To improve clarity, the X symbols have each been replaced with the number 1 (Line 357).
(4) Line 382, "The short time available to prepare the course..." Please insert # of weeks/months to define the short time.
This information has been added (Line 382).

(5) Figure 11. Replace "count" with "number of students", explain the colors (shades of blue), clarify what is week, what is lecture number.
This figure has been revised accordingly.

(6) Consider moving line 410-411 to the acknowledgement section.
This has been moved to Lines 452-453.

(7) Starting line 386, please define "engagement" and explain why you think the engagement was significantly declined through the term. This is interesting!
I added examples of engagement in course deliverables, clarified that the analysis of engagement in Figure 11 is related to non-deliverable course activities, and added an explanation for the decline in engagement (Lines 388-394).

(8) Line 435: "...is available..."
Fixed (Line 442).

(9) First line in conclusion - I suggest revising the sentence to something like "the fall 202 remote offering of GEOE/L 221 achieved coverage of all CLOs from previous in-person course offerings and yielded similar grade distribution (?) - Instead of concluding that the remote offering was "very successful" (unless you define success clearly), I suggest showing what was achieved.
Thank you for this recommendation. I have updated the sentence accordingly (Lines 413-414).

(10) Please include an ethics statement.
Added in Lines 438-439.

In closing, I would like to thank the editors for their comments. I hope the revisions presented in this revised (R2) submission are acceptable for publication, and I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jennifer J. Day, Ph.D., P.Eng., P.Geo.
1st Author & Corresponding Author

Assistant Professor
Department of Geological Sciences and Geological Engineering, Queen’s University
Kingston, ON, Canada K7L 3C3
day.jennifer@queensu.ca