

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)	Understanding how to enhance efficacy and effectiveness of feedback via e-portfolio: A realist synthesis protocol
AUTHORS	Babovic, Mojca; Fu, Ren-Huei; Monrouxe, Lynn V

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Anne Jones Cornell University Ithaca, NY USA
REVIEW RETURNED	05-Feb-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>I think this is a high quality proposal for a realist synthesis. The methods appear to be sound and consistent with an ethical approach to a CMO realist analysis. The appropriate studies are quoted and appear to have the right grounding for the planned research work. My only suggestion for this proposal would be to more thoroughly describe the details of a "feedback via e-portfolio". The proposal does make an assumption that the reader knows what an e-portfolio is, and the reader could glean that definition from context. However, the study would be stronger if the characteristics of this intervention are more thoroughly described and laid out (possibly even in table form). It would help the reader, and eventually the audience to which this work is more relevant, make the appropriate connections about the conclusions drawn from the CMO analysis.</p> <p>I appreciate the opportunity to review this protocol - good luck!</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Prof Illing Newcastle University, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	15-Mar-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for inviting me to review this protocol. I read it with interest. The topic will be of great interest to the community and assuming the protocol is followed as set out should answer an important question. The prospect of identifying a model is a very powerful outcome and will move our understanding forward in order to know how best to provide online feedback and also how to avoid the pitfalls.</p> <p>This protocol is very clearly set out. The authors have consulted the relevant literature and taken advice about how to conduct realist inquiry. No further comments.</p>
-------------------------	--

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1

I think this is a high quality proposal for a realist synthesis. The methods appear to be sound and consistent with an ethical approach to a CMO realist analysis. The appropriate studies are quoted and appear to have the right grounding for the planned research work.

Author Response

We thank the reviewer for their positive feedback.

Reviewer 1

My only suggestion for this proposal would be to more thoroughly describe the details of a "feedback via e-portfolio". The proposal does make an assumption that the reader knows what an e-portfolio is, and the reader could glean that definition from context. However, the study would be stronger if the characteristics of this intervention are more thoroughly described and laid out (possibly even in table form). It would help the reader, and eventually the audience to which this work is more relevant, make the appropriate connections about the conclusions drawn from the CMO analysis.

Author Response

This is a very valid request. We have addressed it as best we can in terms of this being a protocol, and so we are not yet reporting all the ways in which feedback occurs via e-portfolio as this is one of the outcomes of our review work. So, firstly, we address the assumption that readers know what an e-portfolio. We do this in the very first paragraph thereby setting the scene for the study.

The second issue is that of the 'characteristics of the intervention' – be suppose by this the reviewer means the characteristics of 'feedback via e-portfolio'. This is the aspect that we will include in our review – and so therefore setting it out in a Table pre-supposes that we already know the answer to this. However, while we know of some ways in which this occurs – we are constantly coming across other versions of how feedback is used. As such, the best we can do here is add a list of examples. We now do this at the end of the introduction by inserting the following: "Indeed, feedback via e-portfolios can occur variously, including: as asynchronous written feedback in which the educator leaves their comments for the learner to find and read, as synchronous technology-enhanced feedback, as synchronous face-to-face feedback, as mandatory or voluntary and as open access or not.". Additionally, we now plan to include another column in our data extraction spreadsheet to record this information.

Reviewer 2

Thank you for inviting me to review this protocol. I read it with interest. The topic will be of great interest to the community and assuming the protocol is followed as set out should answer an important question. The prospect of identifying a model is a very powerful outcome and will move our understanding forward in order to know how best to provide online feedback and also how to avoid the pitfalls.

This protocol is very clearly set out. The authors have consulted the relevant literature and taken advice about how to conduct realist inquiry. No further comments.

Author Response

We thank the reviewer for their positive feedback.