

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER 2 COMMENTS Round 2

Reference number of the manuscript: 1298527

Reviewer 2

General comments

Point 1: Is the content succinctly described and contextualized with respect to previous and present theoretical background and empirical research (if applicable) on the topic?

Response to point 1: *Thank you again for your valuable comments. Sorry, but we would like to underline once again that this is not applicable to any previous topic.*

Point 2: Are the research design, questions, hypotheses and methods clearly stated?

Response to point 2: *Thank you for your considerate comments. We followed your comments and added some details in Section 3:*

“Categories were grouped into subcategories. In order to provide internal validity of the qualitative study, the texts of the interviews, codes and reproduced categories were evaluated by the first author.

The data acquired were expressed with numbers and percentages.”

Point 3: Are the arguments and discussion of findings coherent, balanced and compelling?

Response to point 3: *Thank you for your valuable comments. We added some new additional information in Section “Discussion”.*

Point 4: For empirical research, are the results clearly presented?

Response to point 4: *Thank you for your considerate comments. Yes, we suggest that the insight and data generated here can be used as a starting point for developing different strategies to improve our teaching and learning process of the Human Anatomy course. Using these results as a guide, a continuous development of the course can be designed to assist in regard to planning, leading and implementing 3D educational activities.*

Point 5: Is the article adequately referenced?

Response to point 5: *Thank you for your valuable comments. The number of citations has been increased. Some of the newly added references provide the reader directly to digitalization, anatomy and COVID-19.*