

As we are working across 2 systems it is now not possible to link the abstract to the new account.**BEME Systematic Review Interim Progress Report**
16 June 2015

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

For this interim report please review from Stage 3 where last review reported in progress

Stage 1:

The pilot review was completed and submitted in February 2014. As this 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:

After duplicate removal, a total of n=343 articles were reviewed by two independent reviewers (lead reviewer and another) using the titles and abstracts against the selection criteria for inclusion. An initial total of n=40 articles fit all criteria and are to be included for the review. An additional n=9 articles have been sent to a third, independent reviewer as following discussion these were unclear for inclusion. Another n=2 review articles are to be screened to ensure all reviewed papers which were referenced have been considered for inclusion. To allow for the review to be as current as possible, an RSS feed has been established to identify new publications and this may bring in a small number of additional articles to be considered. A Kappa coefficient for inclusion agreement was calculated using IBM-SBSS v. 21 as 0.86.

Stage 4:

Data is currently being abstracted to a structured coding sheet as previously reviewed and approved by BEME during the pilot review process. Article 1 was piloted by the two reviewers independently prior to continuation, allowing for final review of the usability of the coding sheet. Completed data coding sheets will then be reviewed by a third independent reviewer and data compiled in a structured 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 could influence the final number of articles reviewed for inclusion) this should not present a problem in terms of currency of information. The initial large number of articles to be considered was unanticipated and the search strategy may have benefitted from slight further refinement, however, 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 **November 2015** with anticipated submission by early **December 2015**.