

Name of journal: World Journal of Meta-Analysis

Manuscript NO.: 55072

Column: Field of Vision

Title: Learning and competence development via clinical cases – which ingredients should be investigated to establish good medical doctors?

Authors: Henriette Löffler-Stastka, Guoruey Wong

Corresponding author: Henriette Löffler-Stastka, MD, Associate Professor, Dean, Department of Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy, and Teaching Center, Medical University of Vienna/General Hospital of Vienna, Department of Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy, and Teaching Center, Medical University of Vienna/General Hospital of Vienna, Waehringer Guertel 18-20, A-1090, Vienna, Austria. henriette.loeffler-stastka@meduniwien.ac.at., Vienna A-1090, Austria. henriette.loeffler-stastka@meduniwien.ac.at

Received Date: 2020-02-28

First decision: 2020-05-29

Step 5: Peer-review report(s)

The authors must resolve all issues in the manuscript based on peer-review report(s) and make a point-to point response to the issues raised in the peer-review report(s) which listed below:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Review manuscript nr 55072 Learning and competence development via clinical cases – which ingredients should be investigated to establish good medical doctors? Reviewer's code 01760667 Abstract It is unnecessarily complicated written. Facts and theories are aggregated making it hard to digest. The abstract would merit from a more summarized description of the content of the article, leaving some of the enumerated elements out. Manuscript It is an interesting and initiated survey of the higher education history and development throughout the past couple of decades but the language, length of phrases and piling of theories are unnecessarily complicated. Furthermore, the spelling should be revised. A language review would enhance the readability. On the whole it is an UpToDate description of the current knowledge regarding higher education and the authors proposes research strategies to enhance the evidence-based components to optimize teaching and learning. Apart from a language revision the manuscript gives a valuable survey of the field of higher education. Minor comments Second paragraph An abbreviation should be introduced in brackets after the corresponding word the first time it is used (i.e. CBL and LLL) Page 4 under the heading Competencies Spelling! (Szenario) There are also other spelling faults

➔ **Thank you for your helpful suggestions, we corrected concerning grammar, spelling, style and a native English speaker corrected the whole text.**

Step 6: Editorial Office's comments

The author must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which listed below:

(1) Science Editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a field of vision of learning and competence development via clinical cases. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: It is an interesting and initiated survey of the higher education history and development throughout the past couple of decades but the language, length of phrases and piling of theories are unnecessarily complicated. Furthermore, the spelling should be revised, The abstract would merit from a more summarized description of the content of the article, leaving some of the enumerated elements out; and (3) Format: There are 1 figure. A total of 52 references are cited, with 11 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. A language editing certificate was not provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors did not provide the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. No academic misconduct was found in th Bing search. However, the similar index is 37% in the CrossCheck detection, the repeated sentences should be rephrased. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. Without financial support. The topic has not previously been published in the WJSC. 5 Issues raised: (1) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. (2) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout. (3) The references have to be numbered. (4) The "core tip" section is missing, please add "core tip" section in front of the main text.(5) The "author contributions" section is missing, please add this section in front of the main text. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

➔ **Figure 1 is provided in ppt. now. PMID and DOI numbers are added if available, references are numbered, core tip and author contributions are given prior the introduction/main text.**

(2) Editorial Office Director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

(3) Company Editor-in-Chief: I recommend the manuscript to be published in the World Journal of Meta-Analysis.

Step 7: Revise the manuscript

➔ **The revised manuscript is uploaded with „track changes“ as supplementary material.**