

Title:

**Effective Methods of Teaching and Learning in Anatomy as a Basic Science: A BEME Systematic Review.**

Group Members:

- C. Dominique Losco: Lecturer in Clinical Chiropractic, School of Health Professions, Murdoch University, Perth, Western Australia (Lead Reviewer)
- Dr Amanda Meyer: Lecturer in Anatomy, School of Health Professions, Murdoch University, Perth, Western Australia
- Dr Anthony Armson: Senior Lecturer in Genetics, Immunology and Microbiology, School of Health Professions, Murdoch University, Perth, Western Australia
- Professor William Grant, Professor of Emergency Medicine & Family Medicine, Associate Dean, Graduate Medical Education, State University of New York, Upstate Medical Centre, Syracuse, New York, USA. (International Collaborator)
- Associate Professor Bruce Walker: Associate Dean (Research), School of Health Professions, Murdoch University, Perth, Western Australia

Progress Report – Update on Review Status

*Stage 1:*

The pilot review was completed and submitted in February 2014. As the systematic review forms part of the lead reviewer's overall PhD, the time spent between February 2014 and initiation of the search itself was utilized in the development of a program of study for the entire thesis and completion of the confirmation of candidature process. A review of the pilot process and findings was done just prior to the review of titles and abstracts (stage 3).

*Stage 2:*

The search strategy was employed across each respective database from September 2014 to February 2015. A total of n=17,820 were subjected to an initial title screen by the lead reviewer, where only obviously irrelevant articles were removed. Those included articles focused on radiology, surgery, curriculum design (without

implementation and evaluation), assessment, postgraduate or clinical applications of anatomy and surveys only (where clear). The initial title screen, followed by removal of all duplicates, yielded a total of n=357 articles to be considered for inclusion in the following stage. This demonstrates that the search strategy was indeed very broad, but necessary given the topic in question to ensure inclusion of relevant articles for the final review.

*Stage 3:*

A total of n=357 articles are currently in the process of being reviewed by two independent reviewers (lead reviewer and another) using the titles and abstracts against the selection criteria for inclusion / exclusion. The final number of articles reviewed in this stage may vary slightly as duplicates and obviously irrelevant titles have still been found on occasion through this process, in addition to this further articles may be identified through hand searching of reference lists. In cases of dispute, a third reviewer is being consulted independently for a decision if not resolved initially by discussion. Further consultation with either of the two other reviewers (PhD supervisors) has been required at times to clarify criteria and ensure consistent interpretation of criteria, especially in articles where the methodology is not exceptionally clear. This process of inclusion / exclusion is anticipated to be completed by April 2015. At this stage the number of articles expected for inclusion can be approximated to be around 50-80.

*Stage 4:*

Following this, data will be extracted to coding sheets previously reviewed and approved by BEME during the pilot review process. Data coding sheets will be reviewed by a third independent reviewer and data compiled in an Excel spreadsheet. Data analysis and interpretation will follow toward completion of the review.

Anticipated Date of Completion:

The review is progressing behind previously estimated timelines due to the time lapse between the pilot review and initial search, as well as the size of the initial search and the time taken to perform the initial title screen of n=17,820 by the lead reviewer. Given that the search would still be very recent (with RSS feed on the initial database PubMed continuing – which would additionally influence the final number of articles

reviewed for inclusion) this should not present a problem in terms of currency of information. Due in part to the broad nature of the initial strategy, the large number of articles initially found in the search was not predicted. This required longer time than scheduled for initial review for inclusion / exclusion decisions. The reviewers feel confident that the broader search will prove to be beneficial and provide all relevant articles for inclusion. Going forward, the entire review process is anticipated to be completed by July 2015 with anticipated submission by early August 2015.