Reviewer’s report

Title: Comparative value of a simulation by gaming and a traditional teaching method to improve clinical reasoning skills necessary to detect patient deterioration: a randomized study in nursing students.

Version: 0 Date: 03 Nov 2019

Reviewer: Marie-France Deschenes

Reviewer's report:

This is an excellent scientific manuscript aiming to compare two pedagogical methods for developing clinical reasoning in nursing students, measured by SCTs. The writing of the manuscript is clear, well presented, and rigorously follows the evaluation of the risks of bias when reporting the results of a RCT. It is easy to follow the steps taken by the authors. The article should be accepted with discretionary revisions. I suggested minor clarifications (see attached document) to enhance some elements of comprehension and editing of the manuscript, especially because I was very interested in the subject. The additional files are relevant and help in understanding the phases of the study. It might be suggested that you also include an example of a SCT in the text. The tool is not well known in the community of nursing educators. I suggest too to standardize the second measurement time after the experiment (one or two months after the first measurement?)

Well done!

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?
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