**Response to reviewers’ comments on the article:**

**“Learning outdoors or with a computer: The contribution of the learning setting to learning and the promotion of environmental perceptions”**

We would like to thank both of the reviewers for their constructive, valuable comments. The input has helped us correct, add to, and improve the article. Please find our responses to each of the two reviewers’ comments below:

Reviewer 1:

1. Concepts and terms have been reworded. For example, the term “real world” has been changed to “natural environments.” “Frontal learning” has been has been changed to “conventional / traditional learning” or “traditional teacher-centered learning.” The following sentence in the abstract has also been reworded: “a more compelling learning experience.”
2. Literature review: We have expanded upon large portions of the literature review, delving further into the topics and adding up-to-date sources. We are especially grateful for the list of sources that were recommended. We found them to be very helpful and have incorporated most of them into the article. Several other articles have also been included in the literature review; altogether, fourteen articles have been added or changed in this revision. The topics that we have explored further include the discussion of outdoor learning (p. ???) and the increasing use of mobile technology in outdoor learning (p. ???). We also discuss this latter topic in the Conclusion and research recommendations section (p. ???).

In this revision, we have further developed our critique of traditional classroom learning, using more up-to-date resources (p. ???) and have noted that the importance of outdoor learning seems to be decreasing in Israel (p. ???). In addition, we have changed the final paragraph of the literature review into a sub-section listing the research questions (p. ???). The connection between the variables has been addressed in the introduction (p. ???, paragraph ???).

1. Methodology: As we discuss in the Methodology section, the research population consisted of students from one school who belong to and study in four separate classes. Each of these classes has its own schedule, which allowed us to compare the different groups. In each age group, one class experienced outdoor learning while the other class studied the same topics in the classroom setting using computers.

The fourth-grade students in the study did not have outdoor learning in the third grade, beyond the standard field trips conducted for all students. The curricula that were used (on the topics of plants or animals) were based on the Israeli Ministry of Education’s curricula. The two groups in each age group were taught the same curriculum, but in different environments.

We calculated the effect size (Cohen’s d) and added the findings in Table 3.

1. Results: We have toned down the significance attributed to the findings, both in the Conclusion and recommendations section and in the abstract. With regards to the finding that the difference between students in the outdoor learning environment and students using computers was not statistically significant in terms of their views on harming plants and animals (the results of which may have been significant in a larger study population) – it is also difficult to ignore the fact that, compared with those learning in the computer setting, twice as many children in the outdoor learning setting stated that this was the issue that most bothered them (p ???).

With regards to student-testing, we do not have pre-test findings, and this is indeed a limitation of the present study, duly noted in the revised section on the research limitations (p. ???). Another limitation, also noted there, is that students sometimes find it difficult to answer open-ended questions; thus, 20-30% of the students did not answer the open-ended questions. There was no complete and systematic resource available to help us in this regard, such as student essays that had been saved or documented.

We found it difficult to understand the claim that the findings about the differences between the students in the two different groups (Table 5) were not convincing; the findings surprised us as well, but this is indeed what the students wrote! With regards to the question about why we chose to examine the students’ learning experience if differences in achievements were not found, we would like to emphasize the importance of enjoyment and experience in learning. A variety of studies point to the importance of enjoyment in learning to motivation, interest in learning, and social connections, all of which are elements no less important than academic achievement. In light of this comment, however, we have briefly addressed the significance of the learning experience in the present revision. This appears in the section discussing data analysis of the students’ learning experience (p. ??? paragraph ???).

Reviewer 2

1. We have reworded and toned down several of our claims and have tried to avoid generalizations. We have also expanded upon our critique of traditional classroom learning with the help of up-to-date sources (p. ???).
2. Large portions of the literature review have been revised and expanded. We have strengthened the theoretical basis of our article by adding new, up-to-date sources; altogether, fourteen sources were changes or added. These appear in red in this revised version of the article.
3. The term “frontal teaching” has been changed to “conventional / traditional learning” or “traditional teacher-centered learning.”