

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71308

Title: Effectiveness of the combination of workshops and flipped classroom model to improve tube fixation training for nursing students: a prospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06136260

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-06 03:19

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-08 07:12

Review time: 2 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] Anonymous [<input type="radio"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="radio"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="radio"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article is useful for readers to understand how flipped classroom is adopted in nurse education which may not have many research evidence to examine its effectiveness. However, the researchers may want to write the recommendations and limitations. Please also make good use of teachers' observation and students' conversations to triangulate the quantitative results. Do students have any comments on perceiving the flip class mode? Some sentences are lengthy such as The workshop combined with the flipped classroom training mode is in line with the development of modern informatization, which is helpful to encourage nurses to become the main body of learning and to learn actively, and to ensure the integration of theory with practice in the training courses, so as to achieve the best training effect. The researchers may want to polish the English and grammar mistakes.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71308

Title: Effectiveness of the combination of workshops and flipped classroom model to improve tube fixation training for nursing students: a prospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06000750

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Oman

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-11 05:25

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-21 07:30

Review time: 10 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Anonymous [<input type="checkbox"/>] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [<input type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] No
-------------------------------------	---

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The practical effect of workshop combined with flipped classroom training mode in tube fixation training: a prospective study Yu-Cui Wang, Hui-Lin Cheng, Yu-Mei Deng, Bao-Qi Li and Xuezhen Zhou

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? The title does reflect the main subject of the manuscript; however, it is difficult to read. • I suggest at title along those lines: “Improving the teaching of tube fixation for nursing students using a combination of workshop and flipped classroom: a prospective study”

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? No keywords were mentioned in the manuscript

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? The introduction section is clean but very concise. • I recommend expanding the background a little to present the previous studies that were carried out using the workshop method alone and other studies that used flipped classroom and present the results they found (it was done but very briefly). Then, the significance of combining the two teaching methods, which leads to the aim of this study.

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? The method section lacks clarity. • In “Study design and subjects” please fix the grammar of this sentence: “all nurses were in their first year of working as nurses work for the first year, and had no previous nursing work” • In the entire document, please use “control: and “experimental” group instead of “new nurses of 2018 and nurses of 2019”. • In “contents and requirements of pre-class training”



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

section, please check the tense of the verbs. Present tense was used instead of the past.

- What is the language used to teach the classes? If it is English, I suggest adding an example of the activities, assessment, and evaluation rubric that were used
- The self-designed questionnaire should be presented in the study or at least couple of items so the reader can have a better idea.
- Please present whether the self-designed questionnaire is valid and reliable. Statistics about its reliability should appear in the manuscript.
- Students have prepared the materials before coming to class. How did the authors check whether this was done by all students?
- Ethical consideration section should be added where the authors should explain about how the data was handled, how the confidentiality of students was maintained and whether students had the right to withdraw from the study without being penalized.

6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? The research objectives are achieved by the experiments and presented clearly in the result section. This results of this study show that the combination of a workshop training with flipped classroom improve tube fixation skills in nursing students.

- In “Characteristics of the nurses” and Table 1, percentage should be presented along with the “n”.
- Please present the statistical results correctly so the reader is able to differentiate between which analyses were carried out using t-test, chi-square, and Mann-Whitney U-test.

7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper’s scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently?

- Comments from the nurses were mentioned in the discussion. I believe these qualitative comments should be included in the result section.

8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables

sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? The figure and tables are good 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? No 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? References look good 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? I recommend that the manuscript be checked by a Native English speaker because it is not easy to read. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? The authors mention that the study was approved by the medical ethical committee. However, they don't mention in the main manuscript about the ethical considerations that were followed in order to ensure the confidentiality of the data. Please see my comments to the method section.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71308

Title: Effectiveness of the combination of workshops and flipped classroom model to improve tube fixation training for nursing students: a prospective study

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06000750

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Oman

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-06

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-05 06:40

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-05 06:45

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

No further comments. The authors have addressed all the issues I have raised.