

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)

Interventions to enhance the core competencies of clinical nursing preceptors: a protocol for a systematic review

Authors

Chen, Qirong; Liu, Ke; Wang, Shuyi; Halili, Xirongguli; Liu, Minhui

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

Reviewer	1
Name	Yu, Huidan
Affiliation	Wuhan University
Date	18-Jun-2024
COI	none

The topic of this manuscript is interesting and appropriate, it meets the requirements of current nursing practice.

The methodology is clearly articulated.

It is important to consider the cultural differences in nursing education interventions in different countries.

languages selection is not addressed in the literature search.

Reviewer	2
Name	Jiang, Youli
Affiliation	The People's Hospital of Longhua Shenzhen, Department of Neurology
Date	25-Jun-2024
COI	No

I would like to thank the authors for their valuable research. The authors aimed to conduct a systematic review of interventions to enhance the core competencies of clinical nursing preceptors (CNPs), evaluating their quality and summarizing their effectiveness and limitations.

I read your research carefully. First, I want to congratulate the authors for their well-written and well-designed study. The protocol is thorough and follows established guidelines, ensuring transparency and reproducibility. The inclusion criteria are clear, and the use of the modified Educational Interventions Critical Appraisal Tool (mEICAT) adds a robust framework for evaluating the quality of the studies. Additionally, the consideration of the Kirkpatrick Model for assessing training effectiveness is a thoughtful inclusion, providing a comprehensive evaluation of the interventions.

However, to ensure the manuscript reaches publication quality and is as clear and readable as possible, I have a few suggestions for further improvement:

Sentence Structure and Flow:

Some sentences are quite long and complex. Consider breaking them into shorter sentences to improve readability.

For example:

Original: "Core competencies of CNPs have been discussed in some previous studies 9-11. A Delphi study that included 25 experts showed that the core competencies for clinical nurse educators include clinical teaching competency, clinical nursing skills, management and leadership competency, and innovation and research competency 9."

Improved: "Core competencies of CNPs have been discussed in some previous studies. For instance, a Delphi study that included 25 experts identified core competencies for clinical nurse educators. These competencies include clinical teaching, clinical nursing skills, management and leadership, as well as innovation and research."

Consistency in Terminology:

Ensure consistent use of terms such as "CNPs" and "clinical nursing preceptors" throughout the manuscript.

Grammar and Spelling Check:

Carefully check for spelling and grammar errors. For instance, "registred" should be "registered."

Conciseness and Clarity:

Some paragraphs can be more concise. For example:

Original: "Adequate teaching skills, proficient clinical nursing competencies, and good communication and management qualities are the core elements of being a qualified CNPs."

Improved: "Adequate teaching skills, clinical nursing competencies, and good communication and management qualities are core elements of qualified CNPs."

Citations and References:

Ensure all citations are correctly formatted and conform to the journal's requirements.

Formatting and Layout:

Check that the formatting and layout meet the journal's submission guidelines, including headings, paragraphs, tables, and figures.

By addressing these suggestions, the manuscript can be further refined to ensure it is of the highest quality, thereby enhancing its chances of being published. If possible, I recommend seeking professional academic English editing services for a thorough review.

Sincerely,

Reviewer	3
Name	Bressan, Valentina
Affiliation	Univ Genoa
Date	12-Oct-2024
COI	I confirm that I have understood your policies and agree to the publication of my name in the event that the article is published

Dear Authors and editor

thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting and well written manuscript. The topic you aim to study is very important for the training of future nurses, and I hope my suggestions will be helpful to you.

Introduction

page 7 When describing the available reviews in the literature regarding intervention programs for clinical nursing mentors, I suggest citing the authors of the studies instead of the year of publication for each review mentioned.

Methods

It would be appropriate for you to state here how you intend to analyze and utilize any data you find in the mixed-method studies.

VERSION 1 - AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript according to all of your suggestions. Please see our more detailed revisions in the “**Main Document - marked copy**”. All pages and lines mentioned later are those we added in the “**Main Document - marked copy**”.

- It is important to consider the cultural differences in nursing education interventions in different countries.

Response: Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We acknowledge the importance of cultural differences in different countries in designing and evaluating interventions. However, due to limitations in time and resources, our study mainly focused specifically on the effectiveness and limitations of the interventions, rather than cultural variations. Meanwhile, in the full review, we will extract the data related to context of the included studies (i.e., country, settings in data extraction table). A comparative analysis of interventions considering cultural contexts would certainly provide richer insights, and we appreciate your suggestion.

- Languages selection is not addressed in the literature search.

Response: Thank you for your comment regarding language selection in the literature search. We would like to clarify that the issue of language selection was addressed in the “2.2 Search Strategy” section of the Methods. As stated, “The search will not be limited to a specific language in order to include as much of the available evidence as possible.” This approach was chosen to ensure a comprehensive review of the relevant literature. We hope this resolves any concerns, but we are open to further clarification if needed. (on page 8, line 167-168).

Reviewer: 2

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript according to all your suggestions. Please see our more detailed revisions in the “**Main Document - marked copy**”. All pages and lines mentioned later are those we added in the “**Main Document - marked copy**”.

- Some sentences are quite long and complex. Consider breaking them into shorter sentences to improve readability. For example:

Original: “Core competencies of CNPs have been discussed in some previous studies 9-11. A Delphi study that included 25 experts showed that the core competencies for clinical nurse educators include clinical teaching competency, clinical nursing skills, management and leadership competency, and innovation and research competency 9.”

Improved: “Core competencies of CNPs have been discussed in some previous studies. For instance, a Delphi study that included 25 experts identified core competencies for clinical nurse educators. These competencies include clinical teaching, clinical nursing skills, management and leadership, as well as innovation and research.”

Response: Thank you for your kind suggestion. We have revised the sentence as you suggested. Additionally, we revised sentences throughout the manuscript that were overly long to improve readability.

(Core competencies of CNPs have been discussed in some previous studies. For instance, a

Delphi study that included 25 experts identified core competencies for clinical nurse educators. These competencies include clinical teaching, clinical nursing skills, management and leadership, as well as innovation and research.) (on page 4, line 79-83).

- Consistency in Terminology: Ensure consistent use of terms such as “CNPs” and “clinical nursing preceptors” throughout the manuscript.

Response: Thank you for your kind reminder. We have revised the relevant expressions throughout the manuscript to consistently use the term “CNPs.” See “Main Document - marked copy” for details.

- Grammar and Spelling Check: Carefully check spelling and grammar errors. For instance, “registred” should be “registered.”

Response: Thank you for your kind reminder. We have corrected this misspelling. We have also checked the grammatical and spelling errors throughout the text and made corrections. See “Main Document - marked copy” for details.

(We have registered the protocol in the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews.) (on page 7, line 136-138).

- Conciseness and Clarity: Some paragraphs can be more concise. For example:

Original: “Adequate teaching skills, proficient clinical nursing competencies, and good communication and management qualities are the core elements of being a qualified CNPs.”

Improved: “Adequate teaching skills, clinical nursing competencies, and good communication and management qualities are core elements of qualified CNPs.”

Response: Thank you for your kind suggestion. We have revised the sentence as you suggested.

(Adequate teaching skills, clinical nursing competencies, and good communication and management qualities are core elements of qualified CNPs.) (on page 5, line 89-91).

- Citations and References: Ensure all citations are correctly formatted and conform to the journal’s requirements.

Response: Thank you for your kind reminder. We have reviewed the reference lists to ensure they comply with the journal’s requirements.

- Formatting and Layout: Check that the formatting and layout meet the journal’s submission guidelines, including headings, paragraphs, tables, and figures.

Response: Thank you for your kind reminder. We have checked formatting and layout of headings, paragraphs, tables, and figures to ensure they meet the journal’s requirements.

Reviewer: 3

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript according to all your suggestions. Please see our more detailed revisions in the “**Main Document - marked copy**”. All pages and lines mentioned later are those we added in the “**Main Document - marked copy**”.

- Introduction: page 7 When describing the available reviews in the literature regarding intervention programs for clinical nursing mentors, I suggest citing the authors of the studies instead of the year of publication for each review mentioned.

Response: Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have changed the citation format from publication year to authors of the study.

(DeWolfe's review concluded that there was a lack of reliable evidence about which particular strategy was more effective, but did not assess the quality of the studies using specific criteria or numerical indicators. Windey's review included only quantitative studies of clinical residency preceptor programs and did not consider other healthcare scenarios. Kamolo's review search was limited to the term "Preceptor" and may have overlooked other studies that included related terms. Wu's review is limited to online training programs. Griffiths' review only included clinical preceptor programs for undergraduate students, omitting preceptor programs for graduate students and new nurses. Additionally, it retrieved articles only from CINAHL, Medline, and Google Scholar, which may have led to the omission.) (on page 6, line 111-119).

- Methods: It would be appropriate for you to state here how you intend to analyze and utilize any data you find in the mixed-methods studies.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. We have added instructions for analyzing mixed-methods studies.

(For mixed-method studies, we will extract the research methods, tools, and results for both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of each study. Additionally, we will summarize the effectiveness and limitations of the intervention from both perspectives to provide a comprehensive understanding of the study outcomes.) (on page 9, line 192-195).