

PCIArchaeology #546 Review

- **Title and abstract**
 - Does the title clearly reflect the content of the article? Yes
 - Does the abstract present the main findings of the study? Yes
- **Introduction**
 - Are the research questions/hypotheses/predictions clearly presented? Yes
 - Does the introduction build on relevant research in the field? Yes
- **Materials and methods**
 - Are the methods and analyses sufficiently detailed to allow replication by other researchers? Yes
 - Are the methods and statistical analyses appropriate and well described? Yes
- **Results**
 - In the case of negative results, is there a statistical power analysis (or an adequate Bayesian analysis or equivalence testing)? n/a
 - Are the results described and interpreted correctly? Yes
- **Discussion**
 - Have the authors appropriately emphasized the strengths and limitations of their study/theory/methods/argument? No (see recommendations below)
 - Are the conclusions adequately supported by the results (without overstating the implications of the findings)? n/a

This article presents an overview of a pilot study that will provide an opportunity to test the relative merit of implementing VR immersive experiences in college classrooms. The authors plan to use 360-video, rather than synthetic experiences built in VR, to simulate experiences in international study abroad settings, thus combatting problems of accessibility for economically differentiated students and non-traditional learners with financial obligations that do not facilitate enrollment in expensive study abroad programs. The article is well written and conceived.

Additionally, the authors touch upon several important benefits and limitations of implementing VR in the college classroom, positing that the experience outlined in the article will be nearly if not equally as engaging in terms of content and delivery, despite absence of tactility.

Some points that warrant further consideration and clarification are as follows:

1. The authors delve into the pedagogical rationale behind VR implementation in the college classroom, but the course has not yet been implemented. Will headsets be provided to

online users taking the course remotely? Will they be made available only in a university setting?

2. How will the program be made a learning tool? Are their learning objectives associated with the experience so that it can be deployed in other university classrooms? Will learning be assessed in a way that parallels classroom instruction? How will leaders and/or instructors address questions from students? These characteristics of the study abroad program should be clarified in the text, particularly when one of the contemporary critiques of VR implementation in in-person classrooms is how such technologies can be transformed into substantive learning tools. This could be included in the form of a table.
3. How many students will benefit from the experience? Although high-enrollment courses are mentioned in the introductory section, it is unclear if the experience will be deployed in high-enrollment classes or if this is only the pool from which data will be drawn. This should be clarified early in the text.
4. Given that one of the aims of this project is to make the study abroad program more accessible, it is important to recognize that students who cannot normally afford traditional study abroad experiences may have financial challenges like limited or poor internet connectivity and inability to purchase personal headsets. How will the authors address problems of bandwidth and equipment when deploying the experience? This should be clarified.

In general, I find the article a strong contribution to our work as archaeologists to bring the past to life in new and exciting ways.