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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript provides a nice overview of how the teaching curriculum was improved at Wuhan University using a combination of theory and laboratory experimental practice to allow integration with basic understanding and experimental knowledge. Retrospective analysis of student results over 5 years indicated how the curriculum has improved performance together with a second portion involving student responses indicated the improvement were appreciated by the students and helped to encourage active learning.

Major compulsory revisions:
1. Can details of the survey or questions asked to the students to assess their preceptions be provided? Was this a specific survey or were these just general comments obtained from the student reports

Minor essential revisions:
1. There are many instances where grammar or word choice does not appear correct. I have listed a few examples below. Please check and edit language and meaning throughout the manuscript. Overall, I feel that the manuscript is difficult to understand at points.
   Line 48: closely with oral clinical, microbiology
   Line 53: pattern with only theory course
   Does “innovated” throughout…… does this mean innovative?
   Line 98: aspetic , not asepsis
   Check italics of bacterial genus and species names
   Line 127: “the results support the hypothesis”….. this should be removed or expanded on here

2. Please clarify details of the experimental procedures (line 91 – 109) to make them easier to understand the processes that were undertaken.

3. table 4: This table needs a legend describing what the numbers and the percentages mean. Also, please clarify what the values in the “subtotal” row and column mean. Should one of these be labeled “ total” or “average”?

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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