

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

Title (Provisional)

Exploring patient involvement in obstetrics and gynaecology education for medical students: a scoping review protocol

Authors

Kennedy , Clare; Al-Tikriti, Shahad; Abubakr, Karima; O'Higgins, Amy C; McNulty, Jonathan; Cooney , Naomi; Donnelly, Suzanne; Higgins, Mary

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

Reviewer	1
Name	Armstrong, Susan J.
Affiliation	Univ Witwatersrand
Date	22-Aug-2024
COI	Nil

While some references are used that are not recent, I do not believe it detracts from the protocol and think they are used appropriately.

Reviewer	2
Name	Anokwuru, Rafiat
Affiliation	University of Pretoria
Date	07-Sep-2024
COI	I do not have any competing interest.

The protocol is well written with clearly outlined steps.

Reviewer	3
Name	Yalley, Abena
Affiliation	University of Konstanz
Date	23-Sep-2024

COI

[None indicated].

Dear Authors, thank you deciding to undertake this important study on patient's involvement in obstetrics and gynaecology education for medical students. The study is important and I find the protocol generally well written. A few things nonetheless need some more clarity:

1. For a robust study, I find the number of database for the search quite small (only 6). I will suggest that authors include more database such as PubMed, Web of Science, African online journals, Cochrane Library, SciVerse etc.

2. Please consider correcting the grammar error this sentence and also in the entire protocol:

"will be carried including six electronic databases",

3. "A preliminary limited search of the literature revealed a paucity of studies relating to active patient involvement in obstetrics and gynaecology medical education with identified studies related to patient involvement in the demonstration of physical examination skills". This is a repetition from the previous section

4. "The Kirkpatrick model will be used to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of studies identified" .Please check for clarity because you mention earlier that studies included in the review will not be evaluated for quality.

5. Why PCC and not PICO?

6. "This study focusses on the education of medical students and includes both undergraduate and graduate entry students but excludes already qualified doctors in postgraduate specialist training or other health professionals working in obstetrics or gynaecology as the aim of this study is to analyse the extent of patient contact for those students who have yet to embark on their journey into clinical practice." The sentence is too long. Also check for grammar errors

7. The inclusion criteria is not clear and defined enough. Authors should revise and set clear criteria used for the inclusion of the studies as well as exclusion of the studies.

VERSION 1 - AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Dr. Susan J. Armstrong, Univ Witwatersrand

Comments to the Author:

While some references are used that are not recent, I do not believe it detracts from the protocol and think they are used appropriately.

Thank you for this and for taking the time to review this protocol.

Reviewer: 2

Dr. Rafiat Anokwuru, University of Pretoria

Comments to the Author:

The protocol is well written with clearly outlined steps.

Thank you for this and for taking the time to review this protocol.

Reviewer: 3

Dr. Abena Yalley, University of Konstanz

Comments to the Author:

Dear Authors, thank you deciding to undertake this important study on patient's involvement in obstetrics and gynaecology education for medical students. The study is important and I find the protocol generally well written.

Thank you for this and for taking the time to review this protocol.

A few things nonetheless need some more clarity:

Thank you for these comments which we believe will further improve this protocol and the following scoping review.

1. For a robust study, I find the number of database for the search quite small (only 6). I will suggest that authors include more database such as PubMed, Web of Science, African online journals, Cochrane Library, SciVerse etc.

Thank you for these comments. These databases have been included in the protocol. We have also decided to include the ERIC database in the protocol as it contains literature related to education. We are particularly grateful for highlighting African Journals online which we were previously unaware of and will now include in future research.

2. Please consider correcting the grammar error this sentence and also in the entire protocol: "will be carried including six electronic databases",

This has been corrected, thank you for highlighting this.

3. "A preliminary limited search of the literature revealed a paucity of studies relating to active patient involvement in obstetrics and gynaecology medical education with identified studies related to patient involvement in the demonstration of physical examination skills". This is a repetition from the previous section

This has been deleted with thanks for highlighting.

4. “The Kirkpatrick model will be used to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of studies identified” .Please check for clarity because you mention earlier that studies included in the review will not be evaluated for quality.

Thank you for highlighting this important point that requires clarification.

We have modified our protocol to state that we will describe how each study evaluated their own learning outcomes according to the Kirkpatrick levels. The Kirkpatrick model will be only be used in a descriptive manner – we will not be evaluating the quality of included studies.

5. Why PCC and not PICO?

Thank you for highlighting this point. The PCC framework was recommended for use for scoping reviews in accordance with the JBI and Arksey & O’Malley frameworks.

6. “This study focusses on the education of medical students and includes both undergraduate and graduate entry students but excludes already qualified doctors in postgraduate specialist training or other health professionals working in obstetrics or gynaecology as the aim of this study is to analyse the extent of patient contact for those students who have yet to embark on their journey into clinical practice.” The sentence is too long. Also check for grammar errors

Thank you for highlighting this – we have changed this sentence as follows:

“This study is focussed on the education of undergraduate and graduate-entry medical students only. We will exclude qualified doctors and other health professional students from the scoping review. We want to specifically analyse patient contact levels for medical students prior before they enter clinical practice and embark on their clinical journeys”

7. The inclusion criteria is not clear and defined enough. Authors should revise and set clear criteria used for the inclusion of the studies as well as exclusion of the studies.

Thank you for highlighting this. On reflection, this is something we agree with entirely and therefore have refined the inclusion criteria. The inclusion criteria are contained within the supplemental material.