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| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript addresses the important topic of innovative teaching approaches in computer science education. It provides a comparative analysis of traditional and innovative methods, offering insights into their relative effectiveness. The study's focus on practical implementation and quantitative outcomes could be valuable for educators seeking to improve their teaching practices. However, the limited scope and depth of analysis somewhat restrict its overall importance to the scientific community. |  |
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