Journal of Medical Education for Future Demands
Volume 21 · Issue 1 · e127652

OPEN PEER REVIEW

The Impact of Modified Team-Based Learning on the Learning of Students in an Orthopaedic Course

Khalid Elfadil Husein, Elsiddig Elhadi Mahmoud

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
9 May 2022	5 Nov 2022	31 Dec 2022	10.5812/jme-127652

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Nasim Gheshlaghi Azar 2
2 **Revision 1** 4
Authors' reply to reviewers 5
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 **Revision 2** Nasim Gheshlaghi Azar 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 11

1 Original submission

1 comment · 25 Jul 2022

Nasim Gheshlaghi Azar Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 25 Jul 2022

Dear Editor
Regarding manuscript No. 127652, the following comments are presented:

"Title"
1- It is recommended to change the title of the manuscript as follows:
"The impact of Modified Team Based Learning on learning of students in an Orthopaedic course"

"Abstract"
1- In the "Background" section, a brief description of TBL and MTBL is recommended. In addition, it is better to explain the aspects related to "Method" (Line 33-35) in the Methods section. The last line of the background section is recommended as follows: In this study, we investigated the impact of Modified Team Based Learning on students' learning in an orthopedic course.
2- It is mentioned that MTBL was developed by the authors of this manuscript. However, the article by Hosna et al. also investigates the effect of "MTBL". If these methods are similar, the words "Developed by the authors" should be deleted. Otherwise, the differences between the two MTBL methods mentioned should be clarified.
3- It is recommended to write the keywords more precisely.

"Introduction"
1- (Line 102-105) Is the modification mentioned "Dividing of a 10-12 people group to 2 group" or "Different facilitators" or both? Clarify the modification of TBL. In addition, it is recommended to consider other studies that have investigated "MTBL" (such as Hosna et al.).
2- (Line 106-108) According to the main objective of this research, that is, the comparison of MTBL with lecture, it is recommended to rewrite lines 106-108 as follows: " In this study, we investigated students' satisfaction, as well as exams' results, following MTBL, in an Orthopaedic course. We assume that MTBL can provide better results, compared to conventional lecture method."
"Method"
1- (Line 156-164): There is no need to describe Omdurman University in the "method" section. These explanations could be deleted or moved to a postscript.
2- (Line 165-175): The repeated explanations about sample size, method, Likert, and so on should be deleted.
3- Regarding the main objective of this research, that is, the comparison of MTBL with lecture, there are no clear questions about this issue in the questionnaire. In addition, there are questions relating to other active non-lecture methods, which are not in line with this research's objectives. How do you explain this?
"Results"
1-The comparison of MTBL with other active non-lecture methods is not in line with the main objective of this research. Give a brief explanation of this issue.

"Discussion"
1- (Line 244): "In this pyramid" is repeated twice.
2-(Line 253-254): These lines consider the comparison of MTBL with active non-lecture methods, whereas Alice's study compares TBL with lecture. There is no congruence between these two notions.
3-(Lines 266-268): Study No.11 considers students' satisfaction with simulation-based learning. What is the relationship between this study and your study that led you to mention it?
4-There is no need to write the full titles of the articles (such as those by Swanson, Faezi, Hosna, Randolph, and Charles).

5-(Line 298): The last line of the discussion should be elaborated on and mentioned in the “Conclusion” as well.

“References”
1- References should be written according to reference formatting standards. It is recommended to use the “End Note” application.

Yours sincerely
24/7/2022

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reply to reviewer:

Referring to the manuscript No. 127652

1- *The title has been changed to: The impact of Modified Team Based Learning on learning of students in an Orthopaedic course*

Abstract :

1- *A brief description of TBL & MTBL was added and was written in bold letters .*
   Aspect of methods lines 33-35 is explained in abstract and written in bold letters.
   The following has been added as the last line of the background : In this study, we investigated the impact of Modified Team Based Learning on learning of students in an Orthopeaedic course.(written in bold letters)
2- *The words (Developed by the authors) has been deleted .*
3- *Key words were rewritten in a more précised way (bold letters)*

Introduction :

1- *The two smaller groups (5-6 students each) within the small group (10-12 student) study under a supervision of a single one facilitator (this was added in bold letters)*
   Another study applying a MTBL in different way was added at the end of introduction section and cited (bold letters)

   Lines 106-108 has been changed as following : In this study, we investigated students' satisfaction, as well as exams' results, following MTBL, in an Orthopaedic course. We assume that MTBL can provide similar outcomes as standard TBL. *(written in bold)*

Methods :

1- *Explanation about Omdurman university was deleted*
2- *The repeated explanations about sample size, method , likert, and…. Has been deleted*
3- *According to Miller Pyramid the conventional lecture is located at the bottom , so it is proved that student's center active learning is superior to the conventional lecture . The objective of this study is to study the impact of MTBL on student learning and we assume that it has similar results to conventional TBL . conventional TBL is more suitable for preclinical phase where students are collected in large classes most of the time , where MTBL is more suitable for the clinical phase where students are divided in to small groups for clinical training .*

Results :

1- *According to Miller pyramid , the active non-lecture teaching methods occupy higher levels . MTBL is an active non-lecture method. We assume that it has a good impact on student's learning and has similar results to conventional TBL which is one of the active non-lecture methods*

Discussion :

1- *Duplication of writing was corrected*
2- *A new study (***. Michaelsen et al compared TBL to cooperative learning and problem-based learning They found that the ultimate objective of the group work in TBL, CL, and PBL is essentially the same —that is, motivating students to engage in conversations about the content in ways that improve learning)** has replaced the study comparing TBL to conventional lecture and the citation has been changed
3- *The study of student satisfaction about simulation based study was mentioned to explain that students satisfaction is an important measure when evaluating a learning method*
4- *The whole titles of the articles were deleted*
5- *The last line in the discussion has more elaborated and mentioned in the conclusion as well (written in bold letters)*

References:

Have been written in the standards of references writing

2 Revision 1

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Reply to reviewer

Abstract:

1- The lines 8, 9,10 and 11 were merged as suggested by the reviewer and were highlighted in the manuscript
2- Line 8 , a professor of Management university in Oklahoma in 1990 was deleted as recommended by the reviewer
3- References in abstract were deleted as suggested by the reviewer
4- Line 12 was deleted as suggested by the reviewer
5- Line 19 was replaced after the end of the sentence in line 15 and was highlighted in the manuscript.
6- Lines 15 and 16 were merge in the same way as the reviewer suggested and were highlighted in the manuscript .
7- Lines 15,16,17 and 18 were written in the ‘methods” and were highlighted there .

Introduction :

1- Line 75 and 77 : references 13 and 14 were corrected and highlighted
2- Line 94 : a brief explanation about MTBL was added and highlighted as recommended.
3- Line 98: Reference number (7) for the study of Ibrahim was added to text and references and was highlighted

Discussion :

1- Line 202 : has been changed to be started with : based on the results of the present study according to the suggestion of the reviewer and highlighted .
2- The reference of the report of national training laboratories (9)was added to text and list of references and was highlighted .
3- Line 228: the reference to Hosny study (14) was added to the references list as required .
4- Line 253 : number 13 was deleted from the text

References :

1- All the references were reviewed carefully and were rewritten based on the standard style of reference writing .

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 26 Dec 2022

Nasim Gheshlaghi Azar Reviewer

ACCEPT 26 Dec 2022

Dear editor
Following the second revision, it seems that the manuscript is ready for publication.
Best regards