Dear Dr Daniel Turek,

After review, we have reached a decision regarding your submission to Data Science Journal, "Effective Data Science Education: A Project-Based Case Study Perspective". Our decision is to request revisions of the manuscript prior to acceptance for publication.

The full review information is included at the bottom of this email. There may also be a copy of the manuscript file with reviewer comments available once you have accessed the submission account. A summary of the requested edits from the editorial team can be found below. Please consider these points and revise the file accordingly:

Editorial Revision Requests:
Major revisions:
.) Adjustment of title to reflect sub-title more closely.
.) Adjustment of abstract and section 2.2 as pointed out by referee.

To access your submission account, follow the below instructions:
1) login to the journal webpage with username and password
2) click on the submission title
3) click 'Review' menu option
4) download Reviewed file and make revisions based on review feedback
5) upload the edited file
6) Click the 'notify editor' icon and email the confirmation of re-submission and any relevant comments to the journal.

Please include a full response to the reviewers' comments alongside your revised manuscript. Please also ensure that your revised files adhere to our author guidelines, that the files are fully copyedited/proofed prior to upload and that all copyright permissions have been attained. This is the last opportunity for major editing, therefore please fully check your file prior to re-submission.

If you have any questions or difficulties during this process, please do contact us.

Please could you have the revisions submitted by 9 Feb 2016. If you cannot make this deadline, please let us know as early as possible.

Kind regards,

Dr Hugh Shanahan
Royal Holloway, University of London
Hugh.Shanahan@rhul.ac.uk

Peer Review Comments

Reviewer A:

1. Originality:

While all research builds upon existing knowledge and evidence, do you believe this submission progresses knowledge on this subject? Are there original findings, or do conceptual arguments provide a somewhat new perspective on established thinking? Select one of the options below, and feel free to elaborate in the comment box.
:
Somewhat original

Comments/Explanation:
:
important area of research

2. Methodology:

Please assess the clarity and overall appropriateness of the methodology, keeping in mind that different criteria may be applied in assessing empirical versus more theoretical or conceptual articles. Are the methodology and data sources noted in the article, and are methodological weaknesses addressed? Overall, do you find the methodology appropriate for the subject matter being examined in the submission? Please briefly explain your response in the comment box, and provide suggestions to the author for bolstering the methodology, if appropriate.
:
Sufficient methodology

Comments/Explanation:
:
Good job providing the empirical analysis with the case study.

3. Clarity:

Do you find the writing to be clear and structured in a logical manner? Please keep in mind that, if an article is accepted, we will work with the author to strengthen the prose and structure. In the comment box, please offer suggestions for strengthening the writing AND/OR the structure of the piece.
:

Very clear

Comments/Explanation:
:
Good job on the restructure and reorganization. It flows better.

4. Ethical approval:

If human or animals have been used as research subjects, are statements of ethical approval by a relevant authority present? Where humans have participated in research, informed consent should also be declared.
If not present, please detail where you think a further ethics approval/statement is required.
:
n/a

5. Other Comments:

Please use the box below to provide other comments, which do not fall into the categories above, to the author.
:
n/a

Reviewer B:

1. Originality:

While all research builds upon existing knowledge and evidence, do you believe this submission progresses knowledge on this subject? Are there original findings, or do conceptual arguments provide a somewhat new perspective on established thinking? Select one of the options below, and feel free to elaborate in the comment box.
:
Slightly original

Comments/Explanation:
:

The content is less original than title promises. These two things should be adjusted.

2. Methodology:

Please assess the clarity and overall appropriateness of the methodology, keeping in mind that different criteria may be applied in assessing empirical versus more theoretical or conceptual articles. Are the methodology and data sources noted in the article, and are methodological weaknesses addressed? Overall, do you find the methodology appropriate for the subject matter being examined in the submission? Please briefly explain your response in the comment box, and provide suggestions to the author for bolstering the methodology, if appropriate.
:
Weak methodology

Comments/Explanation:
:
There is little data, for a journal paper, to support conclusions.

3. Clarity:

Do you find the writing to be clear and structured in a logical manner? Please keep in mind that, if an article is accepted, we will work with the author to strengthen the prose and structure. In the comment box, please offer suggestions for strengthening the writing AND/OR the structure of the piece.
:
Very clear

Comments/Explanation:
:
This has improved.

4. Ethical approval:

If human or animals have been used as research subjects, are statements of ethical approval by a relevant authority present? Where humans have participated in research, informed consent should also be declared.
If not present, please detail where you think a further ethics approval/statement is required.
:
-

5. Other Comments:

Please use the box below to provide other comments, which do not fall into the categories above, to the author.
:
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.

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