

# Responses to Reviewers (2)

## Data Science Journal submission #574

We again thank the reviewers for their time and critical review. There appear to be two main comments requiring revision, both of which have been addressed.

(1) The updated version of the paper presents a more convincing narrative. Nevertheless, I think the title of the paper overpromises and it is the subtitle that correctly represents the contribution. My recommendation is to adjust the title accordingly.

There are some aspects of the paper that I would consider useful and publication worthy. I would be more comfortable with the paper on the whole of the title, and partially the abstract, didn't overpromise.

We have changed the title to reflect this. The title of our revised submission is:

[A Project-Based Case Study of Data Science Education](#)

Similarly, the abstract has been revised to focus on the case study itself, and not over-promise a broader perspective or analysis.

(2) Lastly, the section 2.2 on experiential learning and flipped classroom should be rewritten. It is over-simplistic.

Section 2.2 Experiential Learning (Flipped Classroom) has been revised substantially. It now provides a more general explanation of experiential learning, then describes how and why the Collaborative implemented this methodology.