



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_32800
Title of the Manuscript:	Using Simulation in Cupping Therapy Training Course for Undergraduate Medical Students: A Pilot Study in Riyadh, KSA.
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	• Title doesn't read well (option: Using Simulation in Cupping Therapy Training Medical Students... • I'd recommend having a native English speaker proofread this and use "spell check": - o Spaces between words and end of sentences missing throughout the document. (one example in objective section of abstract: ...post-simulationsurvey. Also in the conclusion would change sentence to "Further development and larger studies are recommended..." - o Small words throughout missing and grammar errors. Errors in capitalization. ■ Objective: To assess effectiveness of using cupping therapy simulation in a training course... ■ Improving skills vs skills improving • I'm not following the last 2 paragraphs of the result section, they seem like broken sentences and maybe the 2 paragraphs should be combined.	1- Title was modified. 2- Paper was edited and corrected. 3- Last 2 paragraphs were combined.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- o Would say "medical student" rather than "undergraduate medical student," but maybe that is relevant in KSA. - o Over-use of gerunds makes it not read as well - o Intro, 2nd paragraph: Instead of "so, simulation..." I think you mean something like: "Therefore, it was our hypothesis that simulation can provide..." Otherwise, reference your sentence. - o Please define "part task-trainer simulation"	1- This term is relevant in KSA. 2- The paper was edited. 3- Corrected as advised 4- Part task trainers simulation was defined and one reference was added for this. 5- Corrected as advised (such as was used)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- o Use "such as" instead of "like" - o Methods, overall design 1st sentence. Calling it a follow-up study is misleading to reader. Do you mean "This study assesses the experience..." (and you have a misspelling of experience here. Use spell check and you will catch a lot of the errors. - o Methods Target population: FOURTH instead of FORTH - o Target population: your numbers from this section don't seem to add up to the second section. You have 41 students (16 male and 25 female) and later say 40 total students. I think you should make your message more clear which is that there were 40 4th year students that participated in the simulation but 25 were included in this study. Why? Did only 25 return surveys? - o Participants: sentence "...they participated in cupping..." is redundant - o Overuse and misuse of "," - o Course description pre-simulation first sentence: consider "...with introductory lectures and videos that explain the history, types...contraindications, and how to perform various types of cupping" - o Course description pre-simulation: would remove the "students were expected to practice various cupping types..." because I think that's what they did in the cupping simulation. That sentence seems out of place and confuses the reader. - o Part task cupping simulation, first sentence: do you mean "Participants were expected to perform the cupping procedures the just reviewed. The steps include..." - o Simulation scenarios: consider "goals of the scenario" rather than "points reviewed" - o Page 6, post simulation. Are these "sentences" the questions in table 1? If so, can you refer to table 1	- Methods corrected - Fourth instead of forth is corrected - - - - - - - The number was corrected to 41. The participation was voluntary, the students who returned the questionnaire were only 25 - - - - This sentence was corrected. - The whole paper was edited - - pre-simulation first sentence was edited as advised. - - Sentence removed as advised. - - Part task cupping simulation, first sentence was corrected as advised. - - Simulation scenarios: corrected as advised.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	or make a supplement with the questions. - o Results: first 2 paragraphs (page 6). Since you have the percentages already in Table 1, you can probably remove them here and summarize this data more succinctly. - o Discussion: Clarify what field the cleave-hogg simulation was in - o Results: Not clear what you mean by "results are tentative" - o Table 1: is there a way to make this more concise/take up less space. - o I think the mean scores in Table 2 are calculated from points on "do not agree" "somewhat agree" or "strongly agree." Is "do not agree" equal to 0 or 1. It would help to have more of a description in the key. - o Maybe I missed it, but is there a funding source of this study?	- Yes, refer to table 1 was added - Results: first 2 paragraphs. I prefer to include percentages here to clarify these results for readers, and because items in table 1 were not sorted according to percentages. - Clarified - Results are tentative was corrected to preliminary. - Table 1: a trial was made to make it more concise and take up less space. - In table 2: "do not agree" was equal to "0" because the original revised 13 items (SET) utilized this scoring. We follow their rules. Reference 14 - No funding source
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	No Comments	