Journal of Contemporary Educational Research, 2025, Volume 9, Issue 7
http://ojs.bbwpublisher.com/index.php/JCER
ISSN Online: 2208-8474
ISSN Print: 2208-8466

Deep Embedding of Literature Logical Structure in LBL-RBL Pedagogy: A Novel Pathway to Enhance Thesis Proposal Competency in Neuropathophysiology Courses

Rongrong Mao[1], Guangya He[2], Heng Tan[1], Qian Wang[1]*

[1]Department of Pathology and Pathophysiology, Faculty of Basic Medical Science, Kunming Medical University, Kunming, China
[2]Cancer Biotherapy Center & Cancer Research Institute, Peking University Cancer Hospital Yunnan, Yunnan Cancer Hospital, The Third Affiliated Hospital of Kunming Medical University, Kunming, China

**Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.*

Abstract: Graduate students universally struggle with vague topics, insufficient innovation, and logical gaps in research proposals, highlighting the need for structured scientific training. This study presents an innovative pedagogical model embedding scholarly literature's logical architecture into LBL-RBL hybrid teaching, implemented in Kunming Medical University's Neuropathophysiology course. Targeting the complexity of neurological disease mechanisms, the course integrates lecture-based learning (LBL) and research-based learning (RBL) through a small-cohort framework featuring personalized literature-logic embedding → targeted lecture reinforcement → multi-round proposal iteration. Faculty deconstructed domain literature to establish a three-phase training system ("Logic Demonstration-Methodology Mapping-Proposal Embedding"), systematically merging academic logic with research methodology over 9 weeks. Results demonstrate that this problem-driven approach creates authentic scientific inquiry scenarios, activating student knowledge co-construction and collaborative exploration. It successfully enables dynamic competency progression through "cognitive deconstruction → methodological practice → proposal refinement," significantly enhancing proposal rigor and innovation. This study offers a scalable dual-track solution for cultivating advanced scientific capabilities in medical graduate education.

Keywords: Literature logical structure; LBL-RBL pedagogy; Thesis proposal; Neuropathophysiology; Research competency cultivation

Online publication: July 25, 2025

1. Introduction

Developing thesis proposal competency remains a core challenge in medical education. Pervasive issues—topic ambiguity, innovation deficits, and logical discontinuities—reveal limitations of traditional teaching [1]. Lecture-based learning (LBL) overemphasizes knowledge transmission while neglecting research thinking; research-based learning (RBL) often lacks theoretical anchoring, leading to unfocused inquiry [2]. Literature structural analysis transcends mere technical skill-building, constituting a holistic system for cultivating scientific cognition. By deconstructing knowledge production processes, it fosters internalized, structured, critical, and creative thinking paradigms. In empirical sciences like medicine and biology, literature analysis bridges theoretical knowledge, experimental design, and scholarly innovation [3].

To address these gaps, we propose deeply embedding the literature logical structure within LBL-RBL pedagogy. Its innovation lies in using literature as a "cognitive scaffold" through a three-phase pathway ("Logic Demonstration → Methodology Mapping → Proposal Embedding") to bridge theory-practice translation [4,5]. Kunming Medical University's Neuropathophysiology course—taught to about 20 cross-disciplinary graduate students annually (pathology, neurology, etc.)—served as the ideal implementation platform. The design embodied dual-track integration:

(1) LBL track: Systematically delivered core theories (e.g., neurodegenerative disease cascades) and research methods.

(2) RBL track: Deconstructed high-impact literature via faculty-guided phases:

  (a) Logic Demonstration: Modeling "clinical paradox → mechanistic gap → research question" formulation.

  (b) Methodology Mapping: Analyzing "hypothesis → experimental route → evidence closure" argumentation.

  (c) Proposal Embedding: Critiquing literature to inspire "cross-disciplinary transplantation → proposal iteration."

This framework enabled dynamic competency advancement: "cognitive deconstruction → methodological practice → proposal refinement." Instructor roles shifted from knowledge authority to literature deconstruction collaborator; students transformed into problem-driven research agents, aligning with graduate education's "learning-as-research" ethos.

An OBE-aligned tripartite evaluation assessed efficacy, including logical rigor with multi-round proposal iterations evaluated argumentative coherence, innovation critiqued literature depth, and cross-boundary solution design. Knowledge integration: Cross-disciplinary tasks assessed theoretical application.

This paper analyzes the 9-week implementation, demonstrating this paradigm's efficacy in enhancing medical graduates' proposal competency and offering a replicable "theory-training-evaluation" framework.

2. Theoretical framework and pedagogical innovation

2.1. Theoretical foundation: Dual-track cognitive synergy

The model integrates Cognitive Load Theory [6] and Social Constructivism [7]. LBL track optimizes intrinsic load via knowledge structuring (e.g., the tripartite pathological cascade framework of "protein misfolding–mitochondrial dysfunction–neuroinflammation" in neurodegenerative diseases). RBL track activates related cognitive load by using literature logic as a "cognitive scaffolding," this approach trains scientific cognitive modeling abilities within learners' Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). For example, guiding students to deduce the hypothesis-generation pathway for "whether inhibiting calcium channels in Alzheimer's disease model mice can restore cerebral perfusion by relaxing pericytes, thereby reducing immune cell stalling and hypoxia" from a Nature Neuroscience paper [8].

2.2. Innovative pedagogy: Three-phase literature logic axis

Traditional literature instruction often remains at the level of summarized knowledge-based reviews (such as outlining theoretical development trajectories and aggregating research conclusions), resulting in students being trapped in a cognitive dilemma of "know the what but not the why." Our three-phase axis (**Table 1**) enables a paradigm shift from "literature recitation" to "research thinking modeling."

Table 1. Three-phase axis enables a paradigm shift from "literature recitation" to "research thinking modeling"

Phase	LBL integration	RBL task
Logic Demonstration	Faculty deconstructs argument frameworks	Group "literature logic mapping"
Methodology Mapping	Compares methodological strengths	Virtual project technical design
Proposal Embedding	Critiques literature limitations	Hypothesis generation via gaps

2.3. Dual-track mechanism: Cognitive optimization and thinking modeling

The dual-track LBL-RBL mechanism in this study is grounded in Cognitive Load Theory and Social Constructivism, with literature logic serving as the nexus that bridges both tracks to achieve a closed-loop training cycle of "faculty guidance → student practice."

LBL track (cognitive load optimization): Faculty employs three load-reduction strategies: knowledge structuring, explicit logic deconstruction, and methodology comparison (exemplified through AD pathology and therapeutics). Knowledge structuring includes (1) Hierarchical layering: Decouples molecular (Aβ/tau), cellular (glial activation), and systemic (network failure) events; (2) Dynamic interactions: Arrows denote bidirectional pathways (e.g., Aβ → inflammation → tau vicious cycle); (3) Clinical anchoring: Correlates CSF biomarkers (Aβ42↓, p-tau181↑).

RBL track (research thinking modeling): Students achieve competency leaps via: Literature critique (e.g., identifying logic gaps in glioma-neuron interactions); Proposal iteration (e.g., adding spatial transcriptomics for validation); Cross-disciplinary innovation (e.g., transplanting optogenetics to epilepsy research).

3. Implementation and evaluation

3.1. Iterative workflow

Personalized literature embedding: Customized literature packs with annotated logic nodes.

Targeted lecture reinforcement: Workshops addressing common gaps (e.g., causal inference in mechanisms).

Multi-round refinement: Peer review → faculty feedback → revision at Weeks 5 and 9.

3.2. Teaching effectiveness

A representative case example is the progression of an Alzheimer's disease research proposal:

Week 1: Evolved from simply "detecting Aβ toxicity" to investigating the mechanism of "tau protein-mediated impairment of axonal transport" (incorporating the cascade hypothesis logic characteristic).

Week 2: Expanded from Western Blot (WB) protein detection to include snRNA-seq subtyping of glial cell populations (integrating single-cell literature analysis logic).

Week 7: Added a new optogenetic modulation of the default mode network experimental approach (absorbing neural circuit literature technical pathways).

Week 8: Supplemented the proposal with cross-species validation using macaque cognitive behavioral assa ys (integrating translational medicine research logic).

Teacher assessment results revealed that this model enabled 15 graduate students to achieve quantifiable improvements across three dimensions—integration of experimental design, logical rigor, and clinical translatability—in their project proposals submitted in Week 5 and Week 9.

3.3. Quantitative outcomes

Teacher assessments revealed that this model enabled graduate students to achieve quantifiable improvements in methodological integration, logical rigor, and clinical translation in their project proposals submitted in Week 5 and Week 9. Students showed significant improvement across all evaluation dimensions (**Table 2**).

Table 2. The evaluation of the project proposal after training

Evaluation dimension	Draft (Week 5)	Final (Week 9)	Improvement
Methodological integration	5.1 ± 0.9	8.7 ± 0.5	↑70.6%
Logical rigor	6.2 ± 0.7	8.5 ± 0.2	↑39.1%
Clinical translation	4.5 ± 1.3	7.1 ± 0.7	↑57.8%

3.4. Qualitative findings

Qualitative data analysis in this study (primarily based on student reflective feedback texts and structured teacher classroom observation records) provided an in-depth exploration of the specific impacts of the blended teaching model, particularly its core component—literature logical deconstruction training, on the development of students' specific scientific reasoning abilities and higher-order thinking competencies. The findings primarily manifest in the following two interconnected aspects:

(1) Literature logical deconstruction training effectively strengthened "phenomenon-to-mechanism" abductive reasoning ability: Students' in-depth feedback consistently indicated that systematic literature logical deconstruction training significantly enhanced their ability to understand and apply this core scientific reasoning pathway—reasoning "from phenomenon to mechanism." This was specifically manifested in students being able to more clearly identify key phenomena, more actively trace the potential mechanisms or theoretical explanations underlying phenomena, and more consciously evaluate the completeness and logical coherence of the evidence chain when analyzing literature or solving complex problems. Some students explicitly stated in their reflections that this training helped them "penetrate beyond surface-level data to see the underlying principles" and "learn to think like researchers, asking 'why is this so?'"

(2) The blended teaching model holistically promoted the cultivation and demonstration of higher-order thinking habits: Teacher classroom observation records provided strong corroborating evidence, indicating that the blended teaching model employed in this study (integrating online resources, literature deconstruction, collaborative inquiry, and in-class deepening discussions) effectively created a learning environment supportive of higher-order thinking development. Observations revealed that during class discussions, group collaboration, and outcome presentations, students demonstrated significantly increased critical analysis behaviors (e.g., actively questioning assumptions, evaluating the merits of different explanations, identifying flaws in arguments). Their awareness and capacity for interdisciplinary integration were markedly enhanced (e.g., consciously connecting knowledge from

different disciplines to explain complex phenomena, constructing more comprehensive understanding frameworks). Furthermore, thinking qualities such as creative problem solving and metacognitive reflection were exercised and demonstrated to varying degrees. Teacher records frequently noted students exhibiting characteristics of higher-order thinking, such as "posing deeper-level questions," "being able to view problems beyond a single disciplinary perspective," and "mutually challenging and refining each other's viewpoints during collaboration."

In summary, the qualitative data, from the dual perspectives of the learner (student) and the teaching facilitator (teacher), collectively depict how literature logical deconstruction training, as a key pedagogical intervention, effectively underpinned the refinement of students' core scientific reasoning ability—phenomenon-to-mechanism reasoning. Simultaneously, the blended teaching framework within which it is embedded holistically provided a robust, supportive environment for the routine application and habitual cultivation of students' higher-order thinking, particularly critical analysis and interdisciplinary integration.

4. Discussion

This study innovatively embedded systematic literature logical deconstruction and reconstruction training deeply within an organically integrated LBL and RBL teaching framework. This approach was implemented in Neuropathophysiology, a prototypical mechanism-driven discipline. Empirical results demonstrate that this model effectively enhanced graduate students' abductive reasoning ability ("from phenomenon to mechanism") and higher-order cognitive skills such as critical thinking. These gains demonstrably translated into a significantly improved capacity for designing higher-quality research proposals. The following discussion delves deeply into the core innovations, operational mechanisms, and broader applicability of this model.

4.1. Deep embedding: Literature logic as the "neural hub"

The key breakthrough of this study lies in elevating literature logical structure analysis from a supplementary tool to the core pedagogical engine, bridging LBL and RBL, effectively addressing the common disconnect between knowledge transmission (LBL) and research practice (RBL) in traditional integration models:

In the LBL phase (systematic knowledge input), instruction moves beyond merely delivering neuropatho physiology knowledge points (e.g., disease phenomena, molecular mechanisms). Instead, it utilizes carefully selected classic/cutting-edge literature as the primary vehicle. Instructors guide students in deeply deconstructing the intrinsic logical framework of the literature. For example: Clinical phenomenon observation (e.g., cognitive decline in AD patients) → Formulation of core scientific question (Role of Aβ abnormal deposition?) → Establishment of key hypothesis (Synaptic toxicity hypothesis of Aβ oligomers) → Design of multi-tiered validation strategies (molecular, cellular, animal models) → Conclusions and unresolved mechanisms. This process ensures students not only acquire knowledge but also profoundly understand the logical paradigms underpinning knowledge generation, laying the cognitive foundation for subsequent independent research.

In the RBL phase (transferable skill output), students engage in proposal design centered on self-selected neuroscience problems (e.g., mechanisms of α-synuclein propagation in Parkinson's disease). Here, the internalized logical structures from literature become their "cognitive scaffold" for constructing research plans. Students consciously apply the logical framework acquired through deconstruction training: Clearly defining the research phenomenon → Proposing a mechanistic hypothesis → Designing a targeted chain of experimental validation → Anticipating results and theoretical/clinical implications. The "deeper-level questi oning" and "interdisciplinary integrated designs" observed by instructors in the qualitative data are precisely the manifestation of this internalized logical framework, translating into structured proposal design capabilities.

The core value of "embedding": Literature logical deconstruction acts as the "transducer" enabling seamless transition from LBL to RBL, creating a closed loop of "knowledge acquisition → logic internalization → proposal design." Fundamentally, this approach externalizes, structures, and makes trainable the implicit cognitive processes of academic research, directly targeting the common pain points in graduate student proposals, such as "vague research questions, superficial hypotheses, and logical disconnects."

4.2. Neuropathophysiology: Unique value for complex mechanisms

The successful application of this model in the Neuropathophysiology course highlights its unique suitability for handling highly complex, multi-level mechanistic research.

Alignment with disciplinary characteristics: The pathophysiology of neurological diseases fundamentally involves the dysregulation of "multi-scale (molecular-cellular-circuit-behavioral) dynamic interaction networks." Investigating their mechanisms inherently relies on robust abductive reasoning and systems integration capabilities. The structured logical deconstruction reinforced by this model (e.g., clearly separating "phenomenon → hypothesis → validation → conclusion") provides graduate students with an essential cognitive toolkit for navigating such complexity. This empowers them to systematically disentangle intricate causal/associative networks, such as the "Aβ-Tau-Neuroinflammation" axis in Alzheimer's disease, within their research proposals.

Direct manifestations of enhanced proposal design capability: Compared to traditional teaching, students trained under this model demonstrated significant improvements in their project proposals. Enhanced problem focus: Demonstrating the ability to precisely distill the core unresolved mechanistic questions underlying neurological disease phenomena, as opposed to vague descriptions. Increased scientific rigor of hypotheses : Proposing mechanistic hypotheses with greater testability, aligning with the logical paradigms established through prior literature deconstruction. Improved validation logic rigor: Designing experiments that closely revolve around the hypothesis, forming a tightly interlinked chain of evidence (e.g., utilizing specific cell models to validate a protein-mediated neuronal damage pathway). Deeper interpretation of clinical/theoretical significance: Reasonably extrapolating the potential value of the research based on mechanistic analysis.

4.3. Generalizability: A transferable paradigm

Although rooted in Neuropathophysiology, the core innovation of this model—deeply embedding literature logical structure training to bridge knowledge transmission (LBL) and research practice (RBL), thereby enhancing mechanism investigation and proposal design capabilities, possesses broad transfer potential.

Similar mechanism-driven disciplines: The model can be seamlessly adapted to courses such as Cancer Biology (e.g., oncogenic signaling pathways), Cardiovascular Pathophysiology (e.g., molecular mechanisms of heart failure), and Immune-mediated Diseases (e.g., aberrant activation in autoimmunity). The key lies in selecting classic literature that exemplifies the core scientific paradigms of the discipline for deconstruction training.

Scenarios for cultivating advanced research capabilities: This model serves as an effective pathway for enhancing core research planning competencies in graduate students, applicable to developing research proposals, grant applications, and thesis designs. Particularly in the proposal development stage, the structured cognitive framework it provides significantly mitigates the risks of blindness and fragmentation in research design.

4.4. Challenges and AI-powered solutions

Confronting the constraints of small-class teaching resources, future breakthroughs require focusing on intelligent tool development to extend the logic training chain and empower real-time feedback during proposal development:

Developing an "Intelligent Neuroscience Literature Logical Deconstruction Platform": Integrate domain-specific knowledge graphs and NLP (Natural Language Processing) technologies to automatically identify and visualize key logical components within literature (e.g., phenomenon, problem, hypothesis, methods, conclusion) and their interconnections [9]. This platform would support students in conducting preliminary deconstruction learning autonomously, thereby releasing teachers from fundamental instructional burdens [10].

Building an AI-driven "Proposal Logic Diagnostic System": Construct a logic completeness evaluation model specifically tailored for medical research, particularly mechanism-focused studies. This system could analyze student proposals in real-time, performing automated diagnostics on critical aspects [11]: Does the phenomenon description clearly correspond to the core research question? Is the mechanistic hypothesis testable and logically self-consistent? Does the experimental design form an effective chain of validation targeting the hypothesis? Can the anticipated results support the conclusions and clarify the significance?

The system would provide immediate, structured feedback, highlighting logical flaws (e.g., "disconnect between hypothesis and validation methods"), making proposal guidance more efficient, precise, and accessible.

5. Conclusion

This study successfully implemented an innovative pathway within the Neuropathophysiology course: deeply embedding literature logical structure training to bridge LBL-RBL, crack the cognitive challenges of complex mechanism research, and specifically enhance graduate students' proposal design capability.

The model not only significantly enhanced students' structured scientific thinking and proposal design skills but also offers a transferable paradigm for mechanism-driven research education across medical and natural science disciplines. Ultimately, it empowers graduate students to become innovative researchers capable of independently designing and conducting high-quality scientific investigations [12].

This research confirms that the LBL-RBL blended teaching model, centered on deeply embedding literature logical structures, effectively addresses three core pain points in improving graduate proposal capabilities. Its fundamental value lies in:

(1) Reframing the teacher-learner relationship: Teachers transition from knowledge transmitters to logic coaches, while students evolve from passive recipients to active deconstructors.

(2) Bridging the knowledge-practice gap: By transferring literature argumentation paradigms, it shortens the pathway from classroom knowledge to research design.

(3) It externalizes implicit academic logic, constructing a research thinking paradigm centered on "problem-driven inquiry, method-adapted validation, and innovation-oriented discovery."

(4) Achieving structural isomorphism: It establishes structural isomorphism between the teaching process and the research process, fostering a dynamic equilibrium between knowledge application and capability development.

Funding

The Educational Research Project of Kunming Medical University (2023-JY-Y-024 and 2022-JY-Y-011) and Special Research Project for Introduced Talent of Kunming Medical University (J13395001)

Disclosure statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Chen C, Li YM, Li Q, et al., 2022, Exploration and Practice of Scientific Literacy Training Model for Academic Postgraduates. China Continuing Medical Education, 14(15): 155–159.

[2] Guo YD, Zhang QY, Hu XW, et al., 2024, Task-Driven + Inquiry-Based Practice: A Teaching Method for Applied Innovative Talent Cultivation. Educational Progress, 14(10): 372–378.

[3] Korte N, Barkaway A, Wells JA, et al., 2024, Inhibiting Ca2+ Channels in Alzheimer's Disease Model Mice Relaxes Pericytes, Improves Cerebral Blood Flow and Reduces Immune Cell Stalling and Hypoxia. Nature Neuroscience, 27: 1489–1504.

[4] Li Y, Hou HY, Zhu JC, et al., 2013, Application of Knowledge Mapping Method in Scientific Research Topic Selection: A Case Study on the Development and Efficacy Evaluation of Mequindox Nanoemulsion. Library and Information Service, 57(9): 84–91.

[5] Liu YD, 2020, Artificial Intelligence Science: The Sixth Paradigm of Scientific Research. Future and Development, 44(6): 1–6.

[6] Shi BB, 2025, Teaching Reform and Exploration of "Natural Medicinal Chemistry Experiment" Based on Project-Based Learning. Contemporary Chemical Research. (06): 139–141.

[7] Sweller J, Ayres P, Kalyuga S, 2011, Cognitive Load Theory, Springer, New York.

[8] Wagner G, 2014, Research-Based Learning, in Quave CL, ed., Innovative Strategies for Teaching in the Plant Sciences, Springer, 55–70.

[9] Williams C, 2006, A Problem-Based Learning Pathway for Medical Students: Improving the Process Through Action Research. Annals of the Academy of Medicine, Singapore, 35(9): 642–646.

[10] Zhao YX, 2015, On the Deficiency of Cultivating Scientific Research Methodology in Higher Education. Heilongjiang Researches on Higher Education, 2015(5): 68–71.

[11] Zhong YH, Huang XB, 2022, The Value Orientation and Realization Path of Postgraduate Training Objectives in the Era of Artificial Intelligence. Journal of Guizhou Normal University (Social Science Edition), (6): 55–66.

[12] Liang Y, 2023, Construction of a Scientific Knowledge Graph for Research Topic Selection Scenarios, Master's thesis, Xidian University.