M Gmail

Alexandra Czepula <aleczepula@gmail.com>

Revision requested for CPTL_2016_177
1 mensagem

Robin Zavod (Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning)
<EviseSupport@elsevier.com>
Responder a: cptl@midwestern.edu
Para: aleczepula@gmail.com

15 de outubro de 2016
15:09

Ref: CPTL_2016_177
Title: ACTIVE METHODOLOGY AND BLENDED LEARNING: AN EXPERIENCE IN PHARMACEUTICAL CARE
Journal: Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning

Dear Ms. Czepula,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning. I have completed the review of your manuscript and a summary is appended below. The reviewers recommend reconsideration of your paper following major revision. I invite you to resubmit your manuscript after addressing all reviewer comments. **[DUE December 9, 2016]**

When resubmitting your manuscript, please carefully consider all issues mentioned in the reviewers' comments, outline every change made point by point, and provide suitable rebuttals for any comments not addressed.

To submit your revised manuscript:

- Log into EVISE® at: http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL_ACR=CPTL
- Locate your manuscript under the header 'My Submissions that need Revisions' on your 'My Author Tasks' view
- Click on 'Agree to Revise'
- Make the required edits
- Click on 'Complete Submission' to approve

What happens next?

After you approve your submission preview you will receive a notification that the submission is complete. To track the status of your paper throughout the editorial process, log in to Evise® at: http://www.evise.com/evise/faces/pages/navigation/NavController.jspx?JRNL_ACR=CPTL.

Enrich your article to present your research with maximum impact. This journal supports the following Content Innovations:

- Explain your research in your own words and attract interest in your work using AudioSlides : 5-minute webcast-style presentations that are displayed next to your published article and can be posted on other websites. You will receive an invitation email to create an AudioSlides presentation within three weeks after your paper has been accepted.

I look forward to receiving your revised manuscript as soon as possible.

Kind regards,

Dr Zavod
Editor
Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning

Comments from the editors and reviewers:
-Editor

  -

Note to Corresponding Author from Editor-in-Chief: Thanks for your patience while your completed reviews were submitted and I had a chance to review the comments offered. Your reviewers agree that this is an important topic and when revised will be a valuable contribution to the literature. Your reviewers struggled with your manuscript and offered publication recommendations of major revision and reject. There is concern that the translation from Portuguese to English was not preformed adequately and as a result, the manuscript does not read well. The

language/translation problems impaired the flow and overall readability of the manuscript in a very noticeable way. We will need for you to work with a professional copy editor/proofreader and to submit a copy of a paid invoice at the time that you submit your revised manuscript. Without this invoice we will not be able to conduct a second peer review. Your reviewers offered comments that are largely designed to help bring additional clarity and organization to your manuscript. In a couple of places additional detail is needed and guidance has been provided. Please take the time to carefully review the comments offered and revise your manuscript accordingly. Please maintain your manuscript in a de-identified format so that a second peer review can be conducted.

-**Reviewer 1**

 -

Comments:

1.   Are we comparing blended with traditional learning? Is "active methodology" the same as traditional learning? "Active methodology" or adequately described. Same for "blended learning". Need to better define terms and exactly what is being compared. Looks like very different concepts are conflated.

2.   Much of the paper resembles a narration of Bloom's taxonomy and not the application to determine a difference in methods.

1.   Line 40-44: Maybe a more precise definition of the term "pharmaceutical care" could be provided. It would be helpful what the boundaries of this term are in Brazil and compared to those of the World Health Organization. The definition given in line 42-44 is quite broad.

2.   Line 42-43 Why is pharmaceutical care a world novelty?

3.   Line 48: Drug products or medicines may be better than "drugs"

4.   Line 60: Reference after 21 century?

5.   Line 63: No dash after together.

6.   Line 68: What kind of patient care services? And how do they differ from current patient care services?

7.   Line 75-82: Cognitive is defined for the reader but not affective or psychomotor. Please define and contrast terms.

8.   Line 93-114: Rather than describing the use of the table, how will table understanding and usage apply to a blended curriculum to achieve the desired objectives? Use Bloom's to show how objectives will be accomplished only to the extent they attain objectives. More text than needed is used to describe and define Bloom's taxonomy. Probably only need to refer to current Bloom Taxonomy nomenclature and leave out the rest.

9.   Line 123: Please define "Moodle UFPR".

10. Line 139: Significance of this statement? Try rewording lines 139-142 to lay out significance of both evaluations, contrast them and explain why they are important to the blended learning format

11. Line 143: If both evaluations are identical, why use both?

12. Line 149: Define the levels to the reader here for clarity and relate them to earlier defined terms.

13. Line 151 & 154: Need reference for clarity

14. Line 155: Try rewording this sentence.

15. Line 164: When the confidence level $p < 0.05\%$? Please clarify.

16. Line 188-196: Discussion: It is unclear what we are comparing to. There seems to be no control by which to compare to. I don't see where the blended is compared to any traditional methods of teaching.

17. Lines 204-208: This should be intuitive and doesn't have to be stated. The data should speak for themselves.

18. Line 209-211: Was the same methodology used with medical students?

19. Line 212-222: This is all repetitive and should be used in the "Background and Purpose" sections or deleted from discussion. Discussion should be reserved for the experiment itself and not a repetitive description of the

Background and Purpose.

20. Line 223-243: Rather than a lecture on multiple choice questions, we really want results of the experiment compared to present techniques and how they are or are not more effective.

21. Line 245-247: Yet the study was compared to the medical discipline (lines 210-211 223-225)

22. Line 272: Reference #2: Is there an updated descriptive report? This one is 20 years old and may too far removed from modern day pharmacy as a reference and premise for the paper.

23. Line 289: Reference #9: May not need this reference if one is basing the experiment on the current Bloom terminology.

24. Many references are quite old and may not easily relate: References 13, 14,15,28,38

1.   References are older than the newer, descriptive Bloom's nomenclature

1.

-**Reviewer 2**

   -

1. Noticeable number of grammar/translation mistakes. Paper doesn't flow (disjointedness is apparent). Please review translation.

2. Review citation, as it is inconsistent at times (for example, reference 9 is sometimes cited as Bloom and colleagues (line 75) and sometimes as Bloom (line 220).

3. Line 71: Bloom's Taxonomy is not an instrument. it is a framework, a classification system used to define and distinguish different levels of human cognition.

4. Disjointed objectives and methods/results: manuscript aimed to "analyze the implementation of an active methodology in a blended model of education" (lines 3-4), but proposed study design and results presented do not address the "active" portion of the methodology and how it relates to the findings. Further clarification needed.

Have questions or need assistance?
For further assistance, please visit our Customer Support site. Here you can search for solutions on a range of topics, find answers to frequently asked questions, and learn more about EVISE® via interactive tutorials. You can also talk 24/5 to our customer support team by phone and 24/7 by live chat and email.