Thanks to all reviewers for offering so many valuable suggestions! We have taken all the suggestions and made significant improvements to the paper. Below are the major changes:

1. *Clarify research contribution and generalized benefits to other CSCW practitioners and researchers*

We made more emphasis and clarification on our contribution in both introduction and discussion. We emphasize in introduction that while this paper reports a collaborative task in a specific intelligence analysis domain, findings regarding team process and breakdowns meet the interest of the broader CSCW community. This study makes three contributions: 1) we observed a spontaneously adopted interleaving workflow and quantitatively proved that an earlier switch from modeling to analysis improves performance; 2) we distinguished three labor division strategies and five factors that impacted team performance; 3) our result implied that effective collaboration requires teams being aware of not only partner actions, but also contribution value, uncertainty, and context of insight.

1. *More collaboration literature*

Thanks for directing us to the literature. We included literature in collaborative modeling and annotation and believe these help our contribution clearer.

Many researches [@chen2014, @Nokelainen2015] have demonstrated that annotation helps share knowledge when reading and writing, two critical activities in intelligence analysis.

Prilla et al. [@Prilla2013] gave a comprehensive review of collaborative modeling.

1. *It would be good to compare use of CAnalytics to other existing tools*

We admit that albeit all the opportunities classroom study brings us to look into team process in a natural environment over multiple usage sessions, it has its limitations, and being unable to conduct a comparison study is one of them. We added explanation to the method section that all participants were from the same course by the same instructor, and thus should get the same opportunity learning and using new tools. While the study provides us a testbed for CAnalytics, it also provides students a learning experience of applying advanced techniques for collaborative analysis. Students could still opt out this study and use existing tools, in which case, however, we could not analyze and report their data.

1. *Add description the use of CAnalytics outside class, what other systems they used, and the effect*

We added data analysis in the beginning of result:

Teams had three intensive usage sessions over the week, although they could access the tool any time; two sessions were in class and one was outside class before the team report deadline. 22 teams self disclosed that they used CAnalytics as the analytic tool in the project although they were allowed to use any other tool; one team reported that they mostly used Google Doc. The reported usage was confirmed by the system log. Seven teams reported using GroupMe and other instant message outside class. They used these tools for instant communication and coordination of meeting. Ten teams reported using Google Doc. Nine of them used Google Doc only for composing the final team report and CAnalytics for analysis tasks; one team went further and used Google Doc as the main analytic tool.

Finally we have addressed all other minor issues reviewers found, such as the resolution of Figure 5 & 6, and typo in reference [30].