1. Washington DC:

Good Part:

1. Bike sharing description

2. distribution of usage on weekends and weekdays, plot for spread of hubs was clear

Suggestion:

1. Discover more inside information

2. The story can be much more clear

1. Boston:

It was nice to see the prototype of map plot showing starting stations with average time duration. And the heatmap representing trips per hour was really beautiful and it looked professional. The goal of indicating lifestyle difference between users and subscribers and influence of universities sounded interesting too. Hope to know: what’s the story? what to you want to show? What magic are you expecting to do with the data?

1. San Francisco:

We really like your stories and visualizations. We think we can compare the difference between casual and subscriber more, such as duration, distance and the locations that often appear.

1. Pittsburg:

Connecting the bike sharing program in relation to its effect on public transport was smart.  
The visualizations could use legends to be more clear.

1. Minneapolis:

very good presentation, nothing to add

1. Atlanta:

The feedback and suggestions for your story presentation on Bike Share Project are as follows:

**Feedback:**

Nice work with the data.

The story is good and clear.

**Comments:**

The prototypes need legends and could use different colors in the visualizations to make them clear.

1. Chicago:

We came up with the following feedback and suggestions for your presentation.

Feedback:

* Nice emphasis on the background of the bikeshare program. The prototypes were precise and clear.
* Interesting approach to test the effectiveness of bikeshare program against public transport system.

Suggestions:

* We felt that the considered prototypes might not the enough to depict the story in context.
* It was explained that the data about the user, bike ride costs were missing from the datasets, yet you proceeded to consider to emphasize on the difference between recreational and subscribed users in the story. Provide citations of data sources and relative information to avoid ambiguity.

1. Philadelphia:

 With your map data was very hard to read because it had a lot of dead map spots that were no data points were narrowing that will help your visualization be clearer. “How do the university areas and public places affect the rush” is a nice idea.

1. Los angles:

We felt the trips per weekday/hour was replica of heatmap from tableau public data which was nothing new for us.

I was not clear about the vision of the project.

Lifestyle differences between subscribers and casual users. I'm not sure what they mean by lifestyle. Do they have information about these people, or just the trip data? Is that enough information to show a lifestyle? Can they get information about users beyond the trip data?