AUTHOR REPLY ON COMMENTS Editor made on 13 July 2022

Steve Rogers (Editor)

Editor comment on "A snapshot sample on how COVID-19 impacted and holds up a mirror to European water education" by Benjamin M. C. Fischer and Alexandru Tatomir, Geosci. Commun. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2022-5-RC2, 2022

Editor, Comments to the author:

Comments to the author:
Dear Benjamin and Alexandru,

Many thanks for uploading your author response and revised manuscript. The revisions so far have taken on board the reviewers (and my) comments, so thanks for this too. However there are still a few areas that could be revised: I have added some comments to the attached manuscript that I think need resolving/considering before publication (not many - mostly minor comments!). Please contact me if you need any further explanation.

I look forward to seeing the the revised manuscript.

Cheers,

Steve

Dear Editor, Dear Steve,

We are happy you were satisfied with our revised manuscript. We agreed and incorporated most of your suggestions in the revised version. Comments which needed clarification are listed below (editor comment in blue font, with our response in black font).

Best regards,

Benjamin Fischer and Alexandru Tatomir
would a quick thematic analysis be useful here? (Group the responses into larger themes and discuss how common/strong certain themes within the answers were?

Author response: We think performing a thematic analysis by grouping answers to qualitative open questions into larger themes would not necessarily give more information concerning strength than our presented word clouds. In the case of few answers e.g., Q30 it would not provide additional information compared to discussing the available answers in the text. To clarify we rephrased the sentence in L152 as: “Respondents’ answers to more qualitative open questions were discussed in the text (in case of few answers) or were represented as word clouds (if more than ~15 answers were available). In a word cloud, the respondents’ answers were summarized as text and the most frequent answers highlighted (increasing font size and color-changing from grey to orange as the words became more frequent).”

see digital poverty, digital equality and digital competency

Author response: We included this now and rearranged the bullet list as: “In addition, from open feedback we derived challenges concerning digital poverty, digital equality and digital competency faced in the hydrology education during COVID-19:

- Teachers needed additional training to get accustomed to new digital tools and the virtual learning environment including acquiring computer literacy. Required personal electronic devices, e.g., laptops, tablets with pens, video cameras, microphones and headsets, lights and stable internet connections.
- Solving various computer problems (e.g., installing software and driver conflicts when attaching new devices and connection issues).
- Data privacy and cyber security for students and staff. Rethinking the organization of the learning process and designing a new time plan – when moving the classes online.
- Change from student-focused to teacher-focused surface learning.
- Adjusting the online courses to students with visual or hearing problems.”

There are institutions that specialise in online and distance learning (and they do an excellent job). In the UK we have the Open University, for example. I think you should emphasise that moving online/distance was negative for many - but not all!

Author reply: We included the Open University in the introduction as: “Examples of virtual learning environments are university degrees e.g. The Open University (United Kingdom) or open online courses on learning platforms (e.g., edX, www.edx.org; for courses overview use search and keywords hydrology or water; Coursera, www.coursera.org, for courses overview use search and keywords hydrology or water; or CUASHI, www.cuahsi.org/education/cuahsi-virtual-university)
and e-learning using e.g., virtual classrooms (Berry, 2019)

It is correct on-line / distance was not negative for all students. Therefore, we already used the rather weaker form "can". Further we believe as in L266-269 that social interactions are important in education.

standard/traditional

Author reply: the suggested "standard/ traditional" does not fit with CAT's and therefore we did not modify.