

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Protocol for a scoping review on the conceptualization of learning in undergraduate clinical nursing practice
AUTHORS	Stoffels, Malou; Peerdeman, Saskia; Daelmans, Hester; Ket, Johannes; Kusrkar, Rashmi

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Bostjan Zvanut University of Primorska, Slovenia
REVIEW RETURNED	15-Jun-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for letting me review the article, titled “Protocol for a scoping review on the conceptualization of learning in undergraduate clinical nursing practice”. As it is a protocol article, I considered the corresponding journal guidelines. I suggest a major revision of the manuscript in order to streamline the text. In the continuation, some recommendations to the authors are provided in order to improve the manuscript.</p> <p>Abstract: I cannot agree with the sentence: “Learning in the hospital setting is a major form of learning in undergraduate nursing education” Nurses beside in hospitals work also in the primary healthcare sector institutions, nursing homes and also in the community. Hence, it is irresponsible form the authors to state that hospital is a major form of nursing education.</p> <p>Strengths and limitation of the study - this section should be optimized. The following sentence is not informative for the reader of scientific journal: “This study does not include books, book reviews or grey literature«. Consider the use of the future tense, where appropriate.</p> <p>Subsection 1. Identify the research question – I suggest to use the term: Identification (do not present as guidelines with verb, but rather with noun - identification) If numbering is not used for the capital headings, it should be not used also for the subheadings.</p> <p>Subsection: 2. Identify relevant studies. If possible, state the period, when the literature search will be performed.</p> <p>Clinical placements – where possible, consider the use of terms nursing wards. My recommendation is to use the terminology used in instruments representing a golden standard for assessing the clinical practice (for example CLES+T) Please, write Ebsco in capital letters (EBSCO).</p>
-------------------------	---

REVIEWER	Kristina Mikkonen QualMent, TerOpe and DHM projects coordinator PhD, Post-doctoral researcher & University teacher Research Unit of Nursing Science and Health Management Faculty of Medicine University of Oulu Finland
REVIEW RETURNED	23-Sep-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The research area is extremely important. The concept analysis of learning and operationalization of learning into practice is essential part in developing clinical practice of nursing students internationally.</p> <p>In the protocol authors need to put a lot of focus building their theoretical background of the study. At the moment the concepts are not well defined. The reasoning of why study is needed needs to be strengthened by going deeper into the meaning of learning. The organizational structural understanding of why clinical learning is important in nursing is not discussed. Furthermore, learning in clinical practice includes so many different elements for nurse students, e.g. them becoming professional competent nurses, going through different levels of learning for example according to Bloom's taxonomy. Learning includes different learning theories, which also influences the outcomes of learning. Once the theoretical framework is build, authors will be able to provide better methodological structure.</p> <p>Authors claim that there is no study as such completed previously. I disagree. For instance, just recently Flott and Linden (2016) has done concept analysis on clinical learning environment in nursing education. I would recommend authors to study their concept analysis and see the larger picture of the clinical learning environment. Flott EA & Linden L (2016) Concept analysis. The clinical learning environment in nursing education: a concept analysis. <i>J Adv Nurs</i> 72(3): 501–513.</p> <p>I would strongly recommend authors to reconsider their methodology. I was not convinced by argument of choice why authors have chosen scoping review instead of systematic review. The systematic review is a rigid and clear methodology, developed over long period of time. Systematic review also helps to gain definitions of complex concepts. It all depends on your theoretical background, choices of concepts including in search strategy and chosen data analysis. I would further recommend using one guideline for the reviews instead of many. For example, Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD, 2009) is an excellent guideline to make your method process rigid. In protocol PICOS should be already formed and keywords thought through much further. Authors have chosen good database for the review. The review should be scanned by title, abstract and full-text. I would not recommend scanning of abstract by numbers. Your inclusion criteria need to be organized according to PICOS format. Further, I was wondering, why do you want to include only hospital setting, if you are performing concept analysis? The larger understanding of concept in clinical practice would be more useful internationally. I recommend doing quality assessment of chosen studies systematically by two authors separately. JBI includes excellent tools for critical appraisal.</p> <p>The study is important and I hope authors will be ready to work on it further by taking my comments into consideration. This will bring great significance in developing education of nursing in general.</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Bostjan Zvanut

Institution and Country: University of Primorska, Slovenia

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None

Dear authors,

Thank you for letting me review the article, titled "Protocol for a scoping review on the conceptualization of learning in undergraduate clinical nursing practice". As it is a protocol article, I considered the corresponding journal guidelines. I suggest a major revision of the manuscript in order to streamline the text. In the continuation, some recommendations to the authors are provided in order to improve the manuscript.

Authors' response

In reaction to your general suggestion to streamline the text, we removed some redundant sentences, we have changed some wordings and added explanations, specifically with regard to what we mean by 'operationalizations'. As we have already started conducted our review, some of the changes have been made because of uncertainties in the protocol we encountered ourselves during the process.

Reviewer 1

Abstract:

1. I cannot agree with the sentence: "Learning in the hospital setting is a major form of learning in undergraduate nursing education" Nurses beside in hospitals work also in the primary healthcare sector institutions, nursing homes and also in the community. Hence, it is irresponsible form the authors to state that hospital is a major form of nursing education.

Authors' response

We agree that clinical learning takes place in several settings and that the hospital context does not prevail over other contexts. However, to enable comparison of how clinical learning has been studied so far, we decided to focus on one particular setting that is known for offering a wide array of learning opportunities. However, we do agree that repeating this review with studies in other contexts would be valuable.

We have made the following changes to our manuscript accordingly:

- Abstract, introduction, page 1: Learning in the clinical setting is a major form of learning in undergraduate nursing education.
- Introduction, page 3: Learning in the clinical setting is crucial for becoming a competent nurse
- To enable comparison of the use of different concepts, we will focus on the general hospital setting. This context is the traditional setting for nursing training and comprises a variety of factors that may be relevant for learning, such as the presence of registered nurses, peers, and other professionals, as well as complex and acute patients, thereby offering a wide array of multidimensional learning opportunities [13].

Reviewer 1

Strengths and limitation of the study - this section should be optimized.

The following sentence is not informative for the reader of scientific journal: "This study does not include books, book reviews or grey literature«. Consider the use of the future tense, where appropriate.

Authors' response

We changed the statements to the future tense wherever relevant. It is common to include books and grey literature in scoping, so we are not sure if we fully understand your comment on this. We looked up other scoping reviews published in BMJ Open and found them reporting this as well. So we have decided to keep this sentence. However, we have changed the sentence *This study does not include books, book reviews or grey literature*

to This study will not include books or grey literature, which will allow us to map how learning in practice is conceptualized and operationalized in original research.

Reviewer 1

Subsection 1. Identify the research question – I suggest to use the term: Identification (do not present as guidelines with verb, but rather with noun - identification). If numbering is not used for the capital headings, it should be not used also for the subheadings.

Authors' response

In line with previously published scoping reviews and review protocols, we changed the term *identify* to *identifying*.

We understand that the numbering we applied is confusing and inconsistent. To allow recognition of the (numbered) stages of the Arksey and O'Mally framework, we replaced the numbers with 'stage 1', 'stage 2', etc.

Reviewer 1

Subsection: 2. Identify relevant studies. If possible, state the period, when the literature search will be performed.

Authors' response

We added: We will conduct the two searches in June 2018.

Reviewer 1

Clinical placements – where possible, consider the use of terms nursing wards. My recommendation is to use the terminology used in instruments representing a golden standard for assessing the clinical practice (for example CLES+T)

Authors' response

We have changed 'clinical placements' into 'nursing wards'

Reviewer 1

Please, write Ebsco in capital letters (EBSCO).

Authors' response

We have changed our writing of EBSCO into capital letters

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Kristina Mikkonen

Institution and Country: QualMent, TerOpe and DHM projects coordinator PhD, Post-doctoral researcher & University teacher, Research Unit of Nursing Science and Health Management, Faculty of Medicine, University of Oulu, Finland

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below

The research area is extremely important. The concept analysis of learning and operationalization of

learning into practice is essential part in developing clinical practice of nursing students internationally.

Authors' response

We thank the reviewer for the comments. As suggested by the editor, we have changed the text according to the comments we thought were relevant.

Reviewer 2

In the protocol authors need to put a lot of focus building their theoretical background of the study. At the moment the concepts are not well defined. The reasoning of why study is needed needs to be strengthened by going deeper into the meaning of learning. The organizational structural understanding of why clinical learning is important in nursing is not discussed. Furthermore, learning in clinical practice includes so many different elements for nurse students, e.g. them becoming professional competent nurses, going through different levels of learning for example according to Bloom's taxonomy. Learning includes different learning theories, which also influences the outcomes of learning. Once the theoretical framework is build, authors will be able to provide better methodological structure.

Authors' response

We think that examining the meaning of learning as well as the elements of clinical learning and learning theories will be part of the results. In the discussion, we will discuss those results in the light of broader theories.

Reviewer 2

Authors claim that there is no study as such completed previously. I disagree. For instance, just recently Flott and Linden (2016) has done concept analysis on clinical learning environment in nursing education. I would recommend authors to study their concept analysis and see the larger picture of the clinical learning environment. Flott EA & Linden L (2016) Concept analysis. The clinical learning environment in nursing education: a concept analysis. *J Adv Nurs* 72(3): 501–513.

Authors' response

Although we highly appreciate the study of Flott and Linden in the field of nursing education, we think the aim and scope of their study is fundamentally different from ours. However, we decided to explain this in the first paragraph of the introduction (page 3): *A vast body of knowledge exists on factors that influence learning, but the process itself remains underexposed [4].*

Reviewer 2

I would strongly recommend authors to reconsider their methodology. I was not convinced by argument of choice why authors have chosen scoping review instead of systematic review. The systematic review is a rigid and clear methodology, developed over long period of time. Systematic review also helps to gain definitions of complex concepts. It all depends on your theoretical background, choices of concepts including in search strategy and chosen data analysis. I would further recommend using one guideline for the reviews instead of many. For example, Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD, 2009) is an excellent guideline to make your method process rigid. In protocol PICOS should be already formed and keywords thought through much further. Authors have chosen good database for the review. The review should be scanned by title, abstract and full-text. I would not recommend scanning of abstract by numbers. Your inclusion criteria need to be organized according to PICOS format. Further, I was wondering, why do you want to include only hospital setting, if you are performing concept analysis? The larger understanding of concept in clinical practice would be more useful internationally. I recommend doing quality assessment of chosen studies systematically by two authors separately. JBI includes excellent tools for critical appraisal.

Authors' response

We disagree with the notion that a systematic review would be more appropriate and we don't think PICOS are applicable for this kind of literature. Beside, although we will map different concepts, we will not be conducting a concept analysis. We think the scoping methodology has advanced in the past decades so that rigour can be ensured.

Reviewer 2

The study is important and I hope authors will be ready to work on it further by taking my comments into consideration. This will bring great significance in developing education of nursing in general.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Bostjan Zvanut University of Primorska
REVIEW RETURNED	12-Dec-2018
GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for letting me review the article, titled "Protocol for a scoping review on the conceptualization of learning in undergraduate clinical nursing practice". I considered the guidelines for the article typer protocol and wen carefully through the manuscript.</p> <p>IMHO, the paper is prepared according to the guidelines and refers to a relevant topic. Hence, I suggest to publish it. Of course, I am interested also in the results of the final study.</p>