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Reviewer's report:

In general: The text is better now and has enough literature. The new section in the text needs format corrections. The figures are still in bad quality and should not be published. The labeling of the figures is not correct.

In the review I demanded that the online phase should be described in more detail and more precise. (e.g. what content did the students get prior to the face-to-face phase?) This aspect is still missing.

The authors should add to the limitations that they are not able to separate the effects of the FC, TBL and CBL in the study.

P 8, line 37

"Flipped classroom is a special hybrid teaching [7,8], first described by Lage et al. In 2000 [9], was later popularized by Bergmann and Sams in 2012 [10]"

Not completely correct. Lage et al. described the Inverted Classroom Method suitable for Higher Education, Flipped Classroom described by Bergman und Sams is used in school education.

Literature

The whole section is full of inconsistent literature formats. Please redo the whole section.

e.g.: No 22 is not correct. The name of the author is Della Ratta

23-28 are not correct, strange abbreviations and so on.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?
If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal