

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)	How do undergraduate nursing students learn in the hospital setting? A scoping review of conceptualisations, operationalisations and learning activities.
AUTHORS	Stoffels, Malou; Peerdeman, Saskia; Daelmans, Hester; Ket, J.C.F.; Kusurkar, Rashmi

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Amanda Henderson Central Queensland University, Australia.
REVIEW RETURNED	31-Jan-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>The authors are to be commended on embarking on a very fluid, and ill-defined concept such as clinical learning. I enjoyed reading this paper. I believe it is a very pertinent area of investigation. The paper is clear and well-written, the difficulty I have is that the intent of the paper is ambitious, and consequently it is not surprising that the findings fall short of what was proposed. The overview of the papers that were reviewed is detailed and informative; and as I read the paper with much interest I kept reflecting on what this comprehensive analysis could teach us about the research about clinical learning. I did wonder whether it would be useful to draw on concepts about learning from other disciplines to enrich the findings and analysis.</p> <p>There are other papers that while the title indicates a focus on culture, they provide insights into the nature of clinical learning, for example, Newton J., Henderson A. Jolly B. Greaves J., (2015) A contemporary examination of workplace learning culture: an ethnomethodology study. <i>Nurse Education Today</i>, 35,1, 91-96; and also, Henderson A., Cooke M., Creedy D. & Walker R. (2012) Nursing students' perceptions of learning in practice environments: A review, <i>Nurse Education Today</i>, 32(3), 299-302. Exploring the space further might assist in making sense of the findings to add value to what is already known.</p>
-------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER	Cecilia Superchi Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (Barcelona, Spain) & Université Paris Dechartes (Paris, France)
REVIEW RETURNED	30-Apr-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	This manuscript reports a scoping review aimed to investigate how different concepts equivalent to "learning in practice" are used and operationalised and which learning activities are reported in the nursing education literature. The final aim was to propose a terminology to guide future studies.
-------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The authors present an interesting piece of work and should be commended for their effort. In general, the article is well written and reported following the recent published reporting guidelines for scoping review (PRISMA-ScR). A protocol of the study was previously published and any deviation from the protocol was appropriately reported in the manuscript.

The proposed changes are mostly related to the reporting, which should be further improved to increase the clarity and reproducibility of the study.

ABSTRACT

- Please ensure that your abstract conform to PRISMA-ScR reporting guideline; some items from that checklist (e.g. background and sources of evidence used in the first search strategy) are missing.

- Lines 5-9, page 2: The objectives of the study are reported in different ways across the manuscript and this can be misleading (e.g. Lines 5-9, page 2 vs. Lines 16-22, page 3). I would suggest being consistent and reporting the 2 objectives in a similar way. A possible reformulation of the objectives is the following: “The study aimed to examine how different concepts equivalent to “learning in practice” are used and operationalised and which learning activities are reported in the nursing education literature. The final aim was to propose a terminology to guide future studies”.

INTRODUCTION

- Lines 16-22, page 3: Related to my previous comment, I would suggest using the same formulation of the objectives across the manuscript to increase the clarity of the paper.

METHODS

- Lines 22-24, page 4: I would rephrase the sentence in the following way to be consistent to what you stated in the protocol: As scoping is an iterative process, the following research question was added based on the findings along the search process: “Which activities do undergraduate nursing students learn from the clinical setting?”

- Lines 45-47, page 4: Please describe the methods used for screening in search step 1: Did the two reviewers screened the 200 abstracts independently? How did they solve discrepancies?

- Lines 9-19, page 6: Please report how you extracted data from the selected studies: e.g. did you involve more than one reviewer in this process? How did you ensure data accuracy? Did you previously pilot the data extraction form?

- Lines 33-34, page 6: I found the sentence “When possible, the used the original wording was used, when necessary we rephrased before further analysis” not completely clear with repetitions of the word “used”. Please consider rephrasing it.

- Lines 41-47, page 6: Please report how you conducted the experts’ consultation: e.g. did you conduct semi-structured interviews?

RESULTS

- Lines 40-42, page 7: “However, results relevant to our research question could be separated from other findings”. Do you mean you extracted only the data related to nursing students? I found this sentence not completely clear and I would suggest rephrasing it.

- Lines 52-54, page 7: “The mixed method study was also appraised with the CASP, as its focus was on the qualitative data”. I found this sentence not completely clear. Which mixed method study are you talking about? Is a study included in the review? What do you mean its focus was on the qualitative data? Please consider rephrasing it.
 - Line 7, page 9: Typo error (“in de”)
 - Page 9: In the text, you referred to Table 1 instead of Table 2.
 - In the Table 2, I would name the last column as “Learning activities”, and the sub columns as “Studies’ findings used to help the identification of learning activities” and “Learning activities for nursing students in the hospital setting identified by the reviewers”.
 - Pages 19-20: I would suggest restructuring how the results are reported in the pages 19-20. I would suggest using the following paragraphs and subparagraphs in order to increase the clarity of the paper:
 - o Conceptualisation
 - Main concepts
 - Theoretical framework
 - Comparison of conceptualisations
 - o Operationalisations
 - o Learning activities
 - Expert consultation
 - Page 20: I would remove study results in the paragraph’s title
 - Page 19-20: I would suggest adding a figure in the manuscript to visualize the results obtained related to conceptualisations, operationalisations and learning activities. I believe a figure would help the readers to understand better your results. The Figure 2 of this recently published scoping review ([https://www.jclinepi.com/article/S0895-4356\(18\)30652-8/fulltext](https://www.jclinepi.com/article/S0895-4356(18)30652-8/fulltext)) should use as an example.
- DISCUSSION**
- Lines 5-9, page 22: As I have previously commented, I would use the same formulation of the objectives of the study across the paper.
 - Lines 28-30, page 22: “Therefore, a recommendation is...in the light of these specific terms”. Recommendation for doing what and for whom? Which specific terms are you talking about? I would suggest elaborating more this sentence.
 - Lines 33-35, page 22: Why caution has to been taken? I would suggest elaborating more this sentence.
 - Line 40-41, page 22: “In the current studies,...”. Do you mean in the current/present study?
 - Line 43, page 22: typo error (“participants”)
 - Lines 58-60, page 22 and Lines 3-5, page 23: “Obviously, examinations...,which we excluded”. I found this sentence not clear and I would suggest reformulating it. Why were these studies excluded? I would suggest including the reason.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Amanda Henderson

Institution and Country: Central Queensland University, Australia.

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

Please leave your comments for the authors below The authors are to be commended on embarking on a very fluid, and ill-defined concept such as clinical learning. I enjoyed reading this paper. I believe it is a very pertinent area of investigation.

The paper is clear and well- written, the difficulty I have is that the intent of the paper is ambitious, and consequently it is not surprising that the findings fall short of what was proposed.

The overview of the papers that were reviewed is detailed and informative; and as I read the paper with much interest I kept reflecting on what this comprehensive analysis could teach us about the research about clinical learning. I did wonder whether it would be useful to draw on concepts about learning from other disciplines to enrich the findings and analysis.

There are other papers that while the title indicates a focus on culture, they provide insights into the nature of clinical learning, for example, Newton J., Henderson A. Jolly B. Greaves J., (2015) A contemporary examination of workplace learning culture: an ethnomethodology study. *Nurse Education Today*, 35,1, 91-96; and also, Henderson A., Cooke M., Creedy D. & Walker R. (2012) Nursing students' perceptions of learning in practice environments: A review, *Nurse Education Today*, 32(3), 299-302. Exploring the space further might assist in making sense of the findings to add value to what is already known.

Authors' response:

We thank the reviewer for the constructive comments. We agree that the final aim of the paper as presented in the protocol was ambitious and could not be met with the current body of literature. However, we think that this aim helped us determine and reach more realistic objectives such as charting the current body of literature and addressing its gaps, which resulted in this review.

We do agree with the authors' suggestion to draw on concepts from other disciplines. To our knowledge, a comparison between concepts has not been made in related disciplines. We think it would go beyond the scope of this review to relate all the concepts we identified to the broader literature, but instead added a more general suggestion within this line of thought:

“As different learning theories will remain to exist, the use of different concepts might be inevitable. However, we recommend that future studies in this field explain and justify the concepts they use based on previous literature, and critically evaluate findings in the light of the premises of these concepts. In addition to justifying these choices, the literature could benefit if authors compare the assumptions of the concepts they use to frameworks that aggregate characteristics of workplace learning based on previous literature in diverse fields”. Alternatively, a further exploration of the meaning of a concept itself can advance the field.

As we point out in our discussion (such as the section on learning outcomes), we do acknowledge that some of the gaps we address, are partly bridged in the literature that falls outside the scope of this review. However, we could have been more clear about how the current review including its gaps can be interpreted within the broader body of literature, particularly that on the clinical learning environment, and why we think those gaps are still important. Therefore, we have changed the last sentence of the discussion section and added a paragraph:

'In this review, clinical learning has been studied from the viewpoint of the student as a learner, as opposed to the perspective of external factors affecting students' learning. However, as both this review and previous literature have demonstrated, clinical learning is a social process that is highly dependent on the environment. If students feel supported by the team they are more willing to take responsibility and actively create learning opportunities. The current work adds to our understanding of the student's role within the complex structure of clinical nursing education and can be a starting point for future research on how individual interactions between students and their environment promote learning.'

Reviewer: 2

ABSTRACT

- Please ensure that your abstract conform to PRISMA-ScR reporting guideline; some items from that checklist (e.g. background and sources of evidence used in the first search strategy) are missing.

Authors' response: We have added

'Despite its relevance to nursing education, there are gaps in the knowledge about clinical learning and the terminology to describe this.

to the objectives section of the abstract.

Also, we have changed

'In a first systematic search, concepts equivalent to 'learning in practice' were identified. In a second search, studies operationalising these concepts were searched in PubMed, EBSCO/ERIC and EBSCO/CINAHL.'

to

'Two systematic searches were conducted in PubMed, EBSCO/ERIC and EBSCO/CINAHL between May and September 2018; first to identify concepts equivalent to 'learning in practice' and second to find studies operationalising these concepts.'

- Lines 5-9, page 2: The objectives of the study are reported in different ways across the manuscript and this can be misleading (e.g. Lines 5-9, page 2 vs. Lines 16-22, page 3). I would suggest being consistent and reporting the 2 objectives in a similar way. A possible reformulation of the objectives is the following: "The study aimed to examine how different concepts equivalent to "learning in practice" are used and operationalised and which learning activities are reported in the nursing education literature. The final aim was to propose a terminology to guide future studies".
Authors' response: We thank the reviewer for the reformulation suggestion, and have changed the text in the abstract (page 2), introduction (page 4) and the discussion (page 23) accordingly. After having incorporated the comments as well as the editor's comments, we made some small changes to the abstract to stay under the limit of 300 words.

INTRODUCTION

- Lines 16-22, page 3: Related to my previous comment, I would suggest using the same formulation of the objectives across the manuscript to increase the clarity of the paper.

Authors' response: We thank you for pointing out these inconsistencies and have changed the text accordingly (see previous comment).

METHODS

- Lines 22-24, page 4: I would rephrase the sentence in the following way to be consistent to what you stated in the protocol: As scoping is an iterative process, the following research question was added based on the findings along the search process: “Which activities do undergraduate nursing students learn from the clinical setting?”

Authors’ response: We thank you for your suggestion and have changed the text accordingly.

- Lines 45-47, page 4: Please describe the methods used for screening in search step 1: Did the two reviewers screen the 200 abstracts independently? How did they solve discrepancies?

Authors’ response: We have now elaborated on the procedure:

‘The first 200 abstracts were scanned by the two reviewers (MS and RAK) independently to extract potentially eligible concepts. As the same concepts had been selected by the two researchers, the first reviewer screened the rest of the abstracts. After all abstracts had been screened, all concepts were discussed between the two reviewers and a final selection of concepts to be included in the second search step was made. Disagreements were resolved through comparison of the concept with the inclusion criteria, informed by the abstracts. Potentially eligible concepts of which the meaning remained unclear after discussion, were also added to the list of concepts to be used in search step 2.

- Lines 9-19, page 6: Please report how you extracted data from the selected studies: e.g. did you involve more than one reviewer in this process? How did you ensure data accuracy? Did you previously pilot the data extraction form?

Authors’ response: We have added the following sentence:

‘Learning activities were extracted by two reviewers independently (MS and RAK), the other variables were initially charted by the first reviewer and checked by the second reviewer. The extraction form was calibrated during the first five studies and agreed upon after discussion between the first two reviewers. The completed form was discussed in the research team for accuracy and validity.’

- Lines 33-34, page 6: I found the sentence “When possible, the used the original wording was used, when necessary we rephrased before further analysis” not completely clear with repetitions of the word “used”. Please consider rephrasing it.

Authors’ response: We agree with the accidental repetition of the word ‘used’, we have rephrased the sentence to

‘When possible, the original wordings were used in this analysis. Expressions that could not be understood outside the context of the article, were slightly rephrased’.

- Lines 41-47, page 6: Please report how you conducted the experts’ consultation: e.g. did you conduct semi-structured interviews?

Authors’ response: We have added the following sentence:

‘Short semi-structured (telephone) interviews were conducted, in which a written summary of the findings was presented and respondents were asked a) whether they recognized the findings, b) whether they missed anything, c) whether they had any other comments on the findings’.

RESULTS

- Lines 40-42, page 7: “However, results relevant to our research question could be separated from other findings”. Do you mean you extracted only the data related to nursing students? I found this sentence not completely clear and I would suggest rephrasing it.

Authors' response: We have rephrased this sentence to

'However, we restricted our data presentation to findings concerning nursing students in the clinical setting'.

Additionally, we have clarified this in the methods section, stage 6

'collating summarising and reporting results'.

The following phrase was added.

'Study findings that did not relate nursing students' learning in the clinical setting were marked'.

- Lines 52-54, page 7: "The mixed method study was also appraised with the CASP, as its focus was on the qualitative data". I found this sentence not completely clear. Which mixed method study are you talking about? Is a study included in the review? What do you mean its focus was on the qualitative data? Please consider rephrasing it.

Authors' response: As cited in the text, the mixed methods study was Burnard P. Learning from experience: nurse tutors' and student nurses' perceptions of experiential learning in nurse education: some initial findings. *Int J Nurs Stud* 1992;29(2):151-61. We have rephrased the sentence to

'In the only mixed method study included, the quantitative data was analysed only descriptively and was used to inform the qualitative data. Therefore, this study was also appraised with the CASP.'

- Line 7, page 9: Typo error ("in de")

Authors' response: We have corrected the typo.

- Page 9: In the text, you referred to Table 1 instead of Table 2.

Authors' response: We have corrected the typo: We have changed the reference to the table.

- In the Table 2, I would name the last column as "Learning activities", and the sub columns as "Studies' findings used to help the identification of learning activities" and "Learning activities for nursing students in the hospital setting identified by the reviewers".

Authors' response: We appreciate the suggestion of aligning the table column with the paragraph. In line with your suggestion, we have renamed the column as 'learning activities', and the sub columns as 'Main study results, arranged according to the studies' objectives' and 'Learning activities for nursing students in the hospital setting, identified by the reviewers in the studies' result sections'.

- Pages 19-20: I would suggest restructuring how the results are reported in the pages 19-20. I would suggest using the following paragraphs and subparagraphs in order to increase the clarity of the paper:

- o Conceptualisation
 - Main concepts
 - Theoretical frameworks
 - Comparison of conceptualisations
- o Operationalisations
- o Learning activities
 - Expert consultation

Authors' response: We have changed the paragraphs in line with the reviewers' suggestions to:

- Conceptualisations
- o Main concepts
- o Theoretical frameworks
- Operationalisations
- Comparison of conceptualisations
- Learning activities
- Expert consultation
- Summary of results

As the comparison paragraph involved both conceptualisations and operationalisations, we have changed the title, and kept it under 'operationalisations' instead of moving in under the heading 'conceptualisations' as suggested by the reviewer.

- Page 20: I would remove study results in the paragraph's title
Authors' response: We have removed this.

- Page 19-20: I would suggest adding a figure in the manuscript to visualize the results obtained related to conceptualisations, operationalisations and learning activities. I believe a figure would help the readers to understand better your results. The Figure 2 of this recently published scoping review ([https://www.jclinepi.com/article/S0895-4356\(18\)30652-8/fulltext](https://www.jclinepi.com/article/S0895-4356(18)30652-8/fulltext)) should use as an example.

Authors' response: We do acknowledge the value of a figure to represent results. We have to stress though that one of our findings is the absence of clear relationships between concepts, operationalisations and learning activities, so that, contrary to the study the reviewers refers to, the integration of findings within a figure is difficult. However, we did add a figure as the reviewer suggested, to comprehensibly summarize the most important data from table 2. We refer to this figure at the end of the results section.

DISCUSSION

- Lines 5-9, page 22: As I have previously commented, I would use the same formulation of the objectives of the study across the paper.

Authors' response: We have reformulated the objectives to

'The study aimed to examine how different concepts equivalent to "learning in practice" are used and operationalised and which learning activities are reported in the nursing education literature. The final aim was to propose a terminology to guide future studies'.

- Lines 28-30, page 22: "Therefore, a recommendation is...in the light of these specific terms". Recommendation for doing what and for whom? Which specific terms are you talking about? I would suggest elaborating more this sentence.

Authors' response: We have changed the sentence to

'Therefore, we recommend that future studies in this field explain and justify the concepts they use based on previous literature, and critically evaluate findings in the light of the premises of these concepts'.

- Lines 33-35, page 22: Why caution has to been taken? I would suggest elaborating more this sentence.

Authors' response: In response to the comments of both reviewer 1 and 2, we have changed this paragraph and rephrased the sentence as

'As different learning theories will remain to exist, the use of different concepts might be inevitable. However, we recommend that future studies in this field explain and justify the concepts they use based on previous literature, and critically evaluate findings in the light of the premises of these concepts. In addition to justifying these choices, the literature could benefit if authors compare the assumptions of the concepts they use to frameworks that aggregate characteristics of workplace learning based on previous literature in diverse fields'.

- 'Line 40-41, page 22: "In the current studies,...". Do you mean in the current/present study? Authors' response: We have changed this to 'in the reviewed studies'.

- Line 43, page 22: typo error ("particiapants")
Authors' response: We have corrected this typo.

- Lines 58-60, page 22 and Lines 3-5, page 23: "Obviously, examinations...,which we excluded". I found this sentence not clear and I would suggest reformulating it. Why were these studies excluded? I would suggest including the reason.
Authors' response: We have changed this sentence to explain why such studies were excluded.

'Investigation of the relationship between learning and subsequent outcomes can be found in literature addressing particular outcomes (such as skills learning) or about assessment. These fell outside our scope of our review'.

To clarify the function of this sentence within the paragraph, we have changed the last sentence to

'However, also in literature addressing complex learning processes such a clinical learning, a critical discussion of actual and desirable outcomes with reference to the body of literature on this topic, is warranted.'

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Amanda Henderson Princess Alexandra Hospital, Australia
REVIEW RETURNED	19-Jul-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	I appreciate that this is a revised version; The authors focus on the literature, and the findings which are relatively bland. I feel that there is more value in discussing the findings in relation to the broader theoretical literature to make the findings more interesting. Consequently, my comments remain much the same as my previous review, that is, 'the findings fall short of what is proposed'.
-------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

REVIEWER	Cecilia Superchi Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (Barcelona, Spain) & Université Paris Dechartes (Paris, France)
REVIEW RETURNED	13-Aug-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	I appreciate the detailed responses of the authors to my previous comments. I would like to make some more minor points on the revised version of the paper. The proposed changes are mostly related to the reporting and quality of the written language of the paper. I would finally recommend to carefully editing the paper to the authors. ABSTRACT
-------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lines 5-6, page 2: “Despite its relevance to nursing education, there are gaps in the knowledge about clinical learning and the terminology to describe this”. I do think this sentence is quite clunky, and I would suggest rephrasing it a bit. <p>METHODS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 19, page 4: “As scoping is an interactive process”. Please add the reference. • Lines 47-48, page 4: “As the same concepts had been selected by the two researchers [...]”. Do you mean “as two researchers reach the full agreement on the extraction of the concepts from the 200 abstracts”? I would suggest rephrasing the sentence. • Lines 51-52, page 4: “Disagreements were resolved through comparison of the concept with the inclusion criteria, informed by the abstracts”. What is informed by the abstracts? I would suggest rephrasing the sentence. • Lines 7-8, page 5: “After these two searches, reference lists were checked for additional publications” Which reference lists did you check? Please specify. • Lines 17-18, page 6: “The extraction form was calibrated during the first five studies and agreed upon after discussion between the first reviewers”. I would rephrase the sentence in the following way: Two researchers piloted and refined the data extraction form on the first five studies. • Line 35, page 6: Dixon-Woods etc 2005. Please add reference correctly • Line 43, page 6: “[...], resulting in six classes of activities”. I would delete “resulting in six classes of activities” because it is in fact a study result and not part of the methods section. <p>RESULTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lines 33-34, page 7: “The second search [...] generated 9360 results of which 5880 remained after duplicates were removed”. Please double check the numbers (9360 and 5880) you provide in this section because they are different compared to the numbers in the flowchart. <p>DISCUSSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Line 19 page 24: “[...] revealed six classes of activities”. You found five classes of activities. Please correct the number. • Lines 30-31, page 24: “As different learning theories will remain to exist, the use of different concepts might be inevitable”. I found this sentence not clear. Please consider rephrasing it. • Lines 40-45, page 24: “However, we suggest that the exploration of the meaning of a concept [...], it was not always clear whether participants’ experiences related to the same phenomenon”. I found this sentence not clear. Please consider rephrasing it. <p>CONCLUSIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lines 33-35, page 26: “the number of studies that investigate examine how students [...]” I found this sentence not clear. Please consider rephrasing it. <p>FIGURE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fig.1, pag 30. Some numbers of the records reported in the flowchart are different compared to the numbers reported in the main text (section: search results). Moreover, a box explaining the exclusion reasons of the records is not reported. Please ensure to report all numbers correctly and also the box including the exclusion reasons.
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Amanda Henderson

Institution and Country: Princess Alexandra Hospital, Australia Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': none declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below I appreciate that this is a revised version; The authors focus on the literature, and the findings which are relatively bland. I feel that there is more value in discussing the findings in relation to the broader theoretical literature to make the findings more interesting. Consequently, my comments remain much the same as my previous review, that is, 'the findings fall short of what is proposed'.

We would like to thank the reviewer for her constructive comment and suggestion to improve our work. We realize that in our discussion section, we focused too heavily on the shortcomings in the included papers and thereby what we could not conclude, at the expense of discussing what we did find in the context of the broader literature.

We therefore added a sentence to the results section, subheading 'Comparison of conceptualisations and operationalisations'

"However, the overarching focus on students' personal, unplanned learning experience as a result of social interactions, suggests that the use of concepts derived from constructivist and social-cultural theories are most appropriate for studying clinical learning in nursing education."

We also added two paragraphs to the discussion section, in which we discuss our findings with respect to terminology (second paragraph, "our eventual aim.....outside the ward") and to the learning activities ("although some studies....has been interpreted").

Moreover, to rationalize why we do elaborate on gaps in the literature in the discussion section, in the first paragraph of this section we added a sentence to emphasize that this is inherent to the scoping nature of the study:

"The scoping approach allowed for identification of gaps in the current literature"

We changed the rest of the discussion section, abstract and conclusion in line with these additions, and have made some changes in the text and paragraphs order of the discussion to integrate the added paragraphs within the text and to avoid repetitions.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Cecilia Superchi

Institution and Country: Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (Barcelona, Spain) & Université Paris Dechartes (Paris, France) Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below I appreciate the detailed responses of the authors to my previous comments. I would like to make some more minor points on the revised version of the paper. The proposed changes are mostly related to the reporting and quality of the written language of the paper. I would finally recommend to carefully editing the paper to the authors.

We like to thank the reviewers for this second revision and the clear and detailed comments. In addition to our response to the comments below, we have made some changes to enhance readability.

ABSTRACT

- Lines 5-6, page 2: “Despite its relevance to nursing education, there are gaps in the knowledge about clinical learning and the terminology to describe this”. I do think this sentence is quite clunky, and I would suggest rephrasing it a bit.

We have changed this sentence to

‘Although clinical learning is pivotal for nursing education, the learning process itself as well as the terminology to address this topic remain underexposed in the literature’.

METHODS

- Line 19, page 4: “As scoping is an interactive process”. Please add the reference.

We have added a reference to Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 2005;8(1):19-32.

- Lines 47-48, page 4: “As the same concepts had been selected by the two researchers [...]”. Do you mean “as two researchers reach the full agreement on the extraction of the concepts from the 200 abstracts”? I would suggest rephrasing the sentence.

We have changed the sentence into

“as the two reviewers reached full agreement on potentially eligible concepts within these first 200 abstracts”...

- Lines 51-52, page 4: “Disagreements were resolved through comparison of the concepts with the inclusion criteria, informed by the abstracts”. What is informed by the abstracts? I would suggest rephrasing the sentence.

We have changed this sentence to

“Disagreements were resolved through comparison of the concepts with the inclusion criteria, based on their use within the abstract.”

- Lines 7-8, page 5: “After these two searches, reference lists were checked for additional publications” Which reference lists did you check? Please specify.

the phrase ‘of included studies’ was added to the sentence to specify:

After these two searches, reference lists of included studies were checked for additional publications

- Lines 17-18, page 6: “The extraction form was calibrated during the first five studies and agreed upon after discussion between the first reviewers”. I would rephrase the sentence in the following way: Two researchers piloted and refined the data extraction form on the first five studies.

We thank the reviewers for this suggestion, and have changed the text accordingly.

- Line 35, page 6: Dixon-Woods etc 2005. Please add reference correctly

We have changed the citation in line with the reference style.

- Line 43, page 6: “[...], resulting in six classes of activities”. I would delete “resulting in six classes of activities” because it is in fact a study result and not part of the methods section.

We have removed this phrase as suggested.

RESULTS

- Lines 33-34, page 7: “The second search [...] generated 9360 results of which 5880 remained after duplicates were removed”. Please double check the numbers (9360 and 5880) you provide in this section because they are different compared to the numbers in the flowchart.

We thank the authors for noticing these inconsistencies; we have corrected the flowchart in which an error had been made according to the text.

DISCUSSION

- Line 19 page 24: “[...] revealed six classes of activities”. You found five classes of activities. Please correct the number.

We have corrected the number.

We thank the re

- Lines 30-31, page 24: “As different learning theories will remain to exist, the use of different concepts might be inevitable”. I found this sentence not clear. Please consider rephrasing it.

We have changed this sentence to

“The use of various terms for the same phenomenon may be inherent to the existence of different learning theories, that each lack explanatory power to inform all aspects of clinical education”.

- Lines 40-45, page 24: “However, we suggest that the exploration of the meaning of a concept [...], it was not always clear whether participants’ experiences related to the same phenomenon”. I found this sentence not clear. Please consider rephrasing it.

We have removed this sentences as we decided, inspired by the first reviewer’s suggestions, to shift our focus from discussion of the quality of the papers to the outcomes of the papers within the broader literature.

CONCLUSIONS

- Lines 33-35, page 26: “the number of studies that investigate examine how students [...]” I found this sentence not clear. Please consider rephrasing it.

We have removed this sentence and changed the sentences around it:

“This review provides an overview of how learning in clinical practice has been addressed in the undergraduate nursing education literature and which learning activities are reported. These studies often fail to align theoretical concepts with a corresponding operationalisation and analysis of findings, thereby offering little guidance for the use of specific terminology in future studies..”

FIGURE

- Fig.1, pag 30. Some numbers of the records reported in the flowchart are different compared to the numbers reported in the main text (section: search results). Moreover, a box explaining the exclusion reasons of the records is not reported. Please ensure to report all numbers correctly and also the box including the exclusion reasons.

We have changed the numbers in line with the text (see previous comment) and have added reasons for exclusion. For a more detailed account of reasons for exclusion including numbers, we refer to supplementary file 5. We made some small changes to supplementary file 5 to correct some typos and to make clear how the information in the flowchart was derived from this data.

VERSION 3 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Cecilia Superchi Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (Barcelona, Spain) & Université Paris Dechartes (Paris, France)
REVIEW RETURNED	21-Oct-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>I would like to thank the authors for addressing all my comments. I would like just to make a minor point on the revised version of the paper:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lines 52-55, page 5: “Disagreements were resolved through comparison of the concepts with the inclusion criteria, based on their use within the abstract.”. I am not sure what you mean exactly here. I suppose that you already selected the concepts in the abstracts according to the inclusion criteria. I would just say: “Disagreements were solved through discussion.” <p>Finally, I think this work should be accepted for publication.</p>
-------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------