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Reviewer's report:

I have read this paper with great interest. The following are my comments:

1. The authors followed a good structure.
2. Abstract (page 2), there was no mention how many students in the wiki groups and the situation in the conventional groups. The description of questionnaire, summative assessment or checklist to assess the quality and quantity of both groups is not given.
3. Introduction (3-4), is focused on the purpose of the study.
4. Methods (page 5-10), the method section is in detail but there is missing such as
   *What are the tools used to assess the quality and quantity of work
   *Is the duration of the study was from 2016 to 2019?? Is this a longitudinal study or authors included all the students of four years? What were the criteria of selection? Who was the teacher? The same teacher conducted the flipped class or multiple teachers were involved in all four groups? How the teachers' performance was assessed? Were all the teachers had experience of flipped classroom? Who trained them?
   *If students had the right to decide which group they would like to work then how the equal and fair distribution was ensured (good and average students, specialty wise)?
   *Who was involved as teachers on wiki; who trained the students and teachers for wiki teaching? Are teachers were aware of the research objectives or they were blinded?
   *Although in the tables authors mentioned the domains of assessment but is not mentioned in the methods section clearly. Please clarify specifically how the participation was assessed; what was the purpose of using checklist and the content of the checklist, and how many evaluators were involved.
5. Results (page 10-11), There is no mention of summative assessment and quiz results, and also the findings of checklist. These in my opinion are important to share in this study where authors are claiming the positive effect of Wiki on outcomes.
6. Discussion (page 12-15), Students in the non-wiki group did not take advantages of collaborative learning and formative assessment for full. Why this was the case? It is necessary to explain differences and speculate on why those differences exist. Limitation about this study also should be discussed. The empirical evidence is required to justify the statement including teachers' role in classroom activities.
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Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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