

Thank you for providing the updated article. You have made significant progress in addressing many of the points raised in the first round of review. However, there are still some areas that require further work, as several issues from the previous round remain unresolved. I will also address finer details at the sentence level of your article.

1. **Introduction and Framing:** The introduction is now much crisper and more focused.
2. **Goals in the Introduction:** These are also communicated more clearly.
3. **"Open Enough" Rubric:** I see that you've added brief sections in the Methods and Results to explain this element of your study. However, more information is needed. You dedicate considerable time to discussing these results, so we need more context on how they were derived and what they mean. I still have questions about how you define the different classifications. For example, what is the difference between "most open" and "mixed"? What does it mean that Harvestability is a technical rather than pedagogical factor? How did you evaluate that the courses were culturally inclusive? There must be a systematic method behind these results that should be described in greater detail.
4. **Interdisciplinary Group:** You provided details about how the interdisciplinary group was composed in your response, but this information is missing from the article. Please include this in the article. Currently, you mention that the project "can only be accomplished through an interdisciplinary collaboration between scientists, social scientists, and students" for the first time in the discussion section and then again in the conclusion. All elements in these sections should have a foundation earlier in the paper. If this aspect is important to your argument, it needs to be detailed earlier; if not, it can be left out.
5. **Methods in the Abstract:** Please make the Abstract more concise to allow space to briefly explain the methods you used to evaluate your courses. Also, the final sentence of an Abstract is typically the take-home message. It seems unlikely that your main takeaway for this paper is about GIFs. The second-to-last sentence functions much better as a concluding message.

Otherwise, I highly recommend going through every sentence to see if you can make them more concise and to-the-point. There are quite a number of heavy sentences that this reader needed to re-read several times to understand the point or still did not understand. Here are a few examples. If I do not include an explanation then it simply means that it was difficult to read and needs revision for clarity and consistency:

Behind the scenes, was used to facilitate content versioning, co-creation and open publishing of the resources.

Herein OERs and OER-enabled pedagogy (OER-P) play an important role and have seen an update in recent years as an alternative to conventional scholarly and educational publishing.

Recently, the Jupyter Book environment has emerged as an extension that extends the computational Notebook environment with narrative and multimedia content.

In this contribution, we test whether Jupyter Books can indeed act as a diverse, equitable, and inclusive learning environment, embracing the three pillars of "open" social justice: redistributive, recognitive, and representational.

- This was a particularly challenging sentence. Do these pillars correspond with the "first", "second" and "third" in the preceding sentences? If so, we need to know what "redistributive, recognitive, and representational" mean in this regard. Also, you say you "test" these three pillars, but you never mention them again. Please consider deleting this if it does not impact the story further on.

It then demonstrates the openness and accessibility of the framework (including the use of animations), assesses user and student learning experiences, and appraises the framework's co-creation possibilities.

- A paper can document something, but it cannot demonstrate or assess something. You, the authors did these things.

This study was conducted over 4 years as part of two geology courses at the University Centre in Svalbard, a small public university centre in northern Norway.

- Svalbard is not in northern Norway. It is an archipelago in the Arctic Ocean.

Subsequent years saw in-person teaching with minor revisions based on colloquial and questionnaire feedback.

- What is a "colloquial" questionnaire? Colloquial means informal, everyday language. Please ensure that this is described more accurately, both here and other places you use the term.

Fieldwork tested the portability of Geo-UAV, implementing either the online tutorials or exported PDFs while teaching in the field.

Classroom teaching further implemented the colloquial sharing of results and experiences during daily recaps in which students presented both their results and stumbles, with feedback and possible solutions mostly provided by other working groups.

- Classroom teaching? But in the methods you say "Both courses were taught asynchronously during a one-week interval by the same instructors, with all materials provided online." Are the courses asynchronous or not? Please ensure consistency here. Also, you use the word colloquial again. I'm sure you don't mean informal and everyday language.

However, we evaluated Harvestability as a Technical rather than Pedagogical factor, and based the ranking on a combination of colloquial and questionnaire student feedback, as well as on our own observations as educators and instructors.

-What does Harvestability mean? What is colloquial feedback? Please see comment about this method earlier.

Course 1 (n=30) and at the end of Course 2 (n=10)

- But you mention earlier than "n=62 over four years". Please ensure consistency with these numbers.

Unsurprisingly, a subset of students in prior years reported agreement that they were “a bit confused ... when it came to using ” as they were not fully introduced to the platform’s possibilities at the onset of the courses. The differing levels of introduction, however, did not change student-reported inclusiveness in content creations, or their overall learning experience.

Fourth, students affirmed what we had hypothesised– that for students to become contributors, they first need to be comfortable using the tools and be given ample opportunity and freedom to revise content, with the side note that it is reviewed and fact-checked by other students and course instructors prior to implementation.

- You hypothesized? I do not recall you doing this.

Using Jupyter Book/, changes in course content can be easily tracked and reintegrated where applicable with the source or form the starting point for derived educational content, contributing to the community-driven development of OERs that makes learning more accessible.

... seems to have lowered the participation barrier which may also benefit non-traditional learners and students from underrepresented groups who may have less initial experience with either of the topics covered by the modules.

- This idea about non-traditional learners or students from underrepresented groups is conjecture and needs to be deleted, unless you have evidence to back up these claims.