

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

Formative Peer Assessment in Higher Healthcare Education Programs – a Systematic Scoping Review

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-045345
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	03-Oct-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Stenberg, Marie; Malmö Universitet, Care Science Mangrio, Elisabeth; Malmö Universitet, Care Science; Malmö Universitet, Malmö Institute for Studies of Migration, Diversity and Welfare Bengtsson, Mariette; Malmö Universitet, Care Science Carlson, Elisabeth; Malmö Universitet, Care Science
Keywords:	MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING, EDUCATION & TRAINING (see Medical Education & Training), Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies



Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

1		
2		
3	1	
4		
5	2	
6	-	
/		
8	3	
9		
10	4	Formative Peer Assessment in Higher Healthcare Education Programs – a
11		
12	5	Systematic Scoping Review
13		y 1 6
14		
15	6	
10		
17	7	
10	,	
20		
20	8	Marie Stenberg ¹ RN; MNSc <u>marie.stenberg@mau.se</u>
27		
22	9	Elisabeth Mangrio ¹ RN PhD Associate Professor elisabeth mangrio@mau.se
23	5	Ensubern multiple fert, i ind, i isbenue i foressor <u>ensuberning noe mutise</u>
25		
26	10	Mariette Bengtsson ¹ RN, PhD, Associate Professor <u>mariette.bengtsson@mau.se</u>
27		
28	11	Elisabeth Carlson ¹ RN PhD Professor elisabeth.carlson@mau.se
29		
30		
31	12	
32		
33	13	
34		
35	11	Department of Care Science, Enculty of Health and Society Malmö
36	14	Department of Care Science, Faculty of ficatur and Society, Manno
37	15	University, SE 205 06 Sweden
38		
39		
40	16	Corresponding author: Marie Stenberg, Faculty of Health and Society, Jan Waldenstromsg
41	17	25 Malmö University SE 214 28 Malmö Sweden
42	17	25, Wallie Oniversity, 51 21 + 26 Wallie, 5Weden
43		
44	18	Tel: +46 40 665 79 44
45		
46	19	E-Mail marie stenberg@mau se
47	15	E Maii. <u>maire.stenoerS(a)maa.se</u>
48		
49	20	Word count: 3533
50		
51	21	
52		
53	22	
54 55		
33 56	7 2	
50	23	
58		
50	24	
60		

ABSTRACT

1

Background: Formative peer assessment focus learning and development of the student

2	
3	25
4	
6	26
7	27
8	
9 10	28
11	29
12 13	30
14 15	31
16	32
17 18	33
19 20	34
21 22	35
22	20
24 25	30
26 27	37
27	38
29 30	39
31 32	40
33	41
34 35	42
36 37	43
38	44
39 40	45
41 42	45
43	40
44 45	47
46 47	40
48 40	49 50
50	50
51 52	51
53 54	52
55	53
56 57	_ 0
58 59	54
60	55

learning process. This implies students taking responsibility for assessing the work of their 27 peers by giving and receiving feedback to each other. Previous reviews seems to lack 28 29 compiled research considering formative peer assessment in its entirety. The aim of the current systematic scoping review was to compile research about formative peer assessment 30 presented in higher healthcare education, focusing the rationale, the interventions, the 31 experiences of students and teachers and the outcomes of formative assessment interventions. 32 Method: The systematic search in four databases resulted in 1452 studies were 37 met the 33 inclusion criteria and were critically appraised. The critical appraisal resulted in 18 included 34 studies with high and moderate quality. The pertinent data was analyzed using thematic 35 analysis. 36 **Result:** The results present clinical skill-training courses to be a frequent setting for 37 38 formative peer assessment activities, focusing intra-professional peers. The rationale for using formative peer assessment relates to giving and receiving constructive feedback as a 39 40 means to promote learning. The experience and outcome of formative peer assessment interventions from the perspective of students and teachers is presented within three 41 42 themes; 1/the organization and structure of the formative peer assessment activities, 2/ 43 personal attributes and consequences for one self and relationships and 3/ the experience and outcome of feedback and learning. 44 **Conclusion:** Healthcare education must consider preparing and introducing students to 45 collaborative learning and thus develop of well-designed learning activities aligned with the 46 learning outcomes. For formative peer assessment to be effective it needs to be implemented 47 in a collaborative learning environment. Since peer collaboration seems to affect students' 48 and teachers' experiences of formative peer assessment empirical investigations exploring 49 50 collaboration between students is of utmost importance. 51 **Keywords:** Feedback, formative assessment, healthcare education, peer assessment, students, 52 teachers 53 54 55 2 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

- The current scoping review is previously presented in a published study protocol.
- Four databases were systematically searched to identify research on formative peer • assessment.
- Critical appraisal tools were used to assess the quality of studies with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods designs.
- Articles appraised with high or moderate quality were included.
- Since only English studies were included, studies may have been missed that would • otherwise have met the inclusion criteria.

BACKGROUND

Peer assessment is an educational approach where feedback, communication, reflection, and collaboration between peers are key characteristics. In a peer assessment activity, students take responsibility for assessing the work of their peers by giving (and receiving) feedback on a specific subject.¹ It allows students to consider the learning outcomes for peers of similar status and to reflect upon their own learning mirrored in a peer.² Peer assessment has shown to support students' development of judgement skills, critiquing abilities, and self-awareness as well as their understanding of the assessment criteria used in a course.¹ In higher education, peer assessment has been a way to move from an individualistic and teacher-led approach to a more collaborative, student-centred approach to assessment¹ aligned with social constructivism principles.³ In this social context of interaction and collaboration, students can expand their knowledge, identify their strengths and weaknesses, and develop personal and professional skills⁴ by evaluating the professional competence of a peer.⁵ Peer assessment can be used in academic and professional settings as a strategy to enhance students' engagement in their own learning.⁶⁷⁸ The collaborative aspect of peer assessment relates to professional teamwork, as well as to broader goals for lifelong learning. As argued by Boud et al.,¹ peer assessment addresses course-specific goals not readily developed otherwise. For healthcare professions, it enhances ability to work in a team in a supportive and respectful atmosphere,⁹ which is highly relevant for patient outcome and the reduction of errors for patient safety.¹⁰ However, recent research has shown that peer collaboration is challenging¹¹ and that healthcare professionals are not prepared to deliver and receive feedback effectively.¹² This emphasizes the importance for healthcare educators to support students with activities fostering these competences. Feedback is highly associated with enhancing student learning¹³

Page 5 of 30

BMJ Open

and modifying learning during the learning process¹⁴ so students can close the gap between their present state of learning and their desired goal(s). Peer feedback can be written or oral, conducted as peer observations in small or large groups.⁸ Further, it is driven by set assessment criteria.¹ which can be either summative or formative, formal or informal. Summative assessment evaluates students' success or failure after the learning process,¹⁵ whereas formative assessment aims for improvement during the learning process.^{16,4} According to Black and Wiliam,¹⁵ formative peer assessment activities involve feedback to modify the teaching and learning of the students. The intention of feedback is to help students help each other when planning their learning.⁴¹⁷ An informal formative peer assessment activity involves a continuous process throughout a course or education, whereas a formal one is designated to a single point in a course's momentum. Earlier research on peer assessment in healthcare education has provided an overview of specific areas within the peer assessment process. For example, Speyer, Pilz, and Van Der Kruis presented psychometric characteristics of peer assessment instruments and questionnaires in medical education.¹⁸ concluding that quite a few instruments exist; however, these intruments mainly focus on professional behavior, and they lack sufficient psychometric data. Tornwall¹⁹ focused on how nursing students are prepared by academics to participate in peer assessment activities and highlighted the importance of creating a supporting learning environment. Lerchenfeldt, Mi and Eng²⁰ concluded that peer assessment supports medical students in developing professional behavior and that peer feedback is a way to assess professionalism. Khan, Payne, and Chahine²¹ reviewed the role of peer assessment in objective structured clinical examination (OSCE), showing that peer assessment promotes learning but that students need training in how to provide feedback. In short, the existing literature contributes valuable knowledge about formative peer assessment in healthcare education targeting specific areas. However, there seems to be lack of compiled research considering formative peer assessment in its entirety, including the context, rationale, experience, and outcome of the formative peer assessment process. Therefore, this scoping review attempts to present an overview of formative peer assessment in healthcare education rather than specific areas within that process.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

117 METHOD

This systematic scoping review was conducted using the York methodology by Arksey and
 O'Malley ²² and the recommendations presented by Levac, Colquhuan, and O'Brien.²³ We
 constructed a scoping protocol, utilizing a PRISMA-P protocol, to present the planned
 methodology for the scoping review.²⁴

Aim and research questions

We aimed to compile research about formative peer assessment presented in higher healthcare education. The research questions were as follows: What are the rationales for using formative peer assessment in healthcare education? How are formative peer assessment interventions delivered in healthcare education and in what context? What experiences of formative peer assessment do students and teachers in healthcare education have? What are the outcomes of formative peer assessment interventions? We used the "Population Concept and Context" (PCC) elements recommended for scoping reviews to establish effective search criteria (Table 1).²⁵

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

132 Relevant studies identified

The literature search was conducted in the databases PubMed, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), Education Research Complete (ERIC), and Education Research Centre (ERC). Search tools such as Medical Subject Headings, Headings, Thesaurus and Boolean operators (AND/OR) helped expand and narrow the search. Initially, the search terms were broad (e.g., peer assessment or higher education) in order to capture the range of published literature. However, the extensiveness of material made it necessary to narrow the search terms and organize them in three major blocks. The following inclusion criteria were applied in the search: (a) articles addressing formative peer assessment in higher education; (b) students and teachers in medical-nursing, midwifery, dentistry, physical or occupational therapy, and radiology; and (c) peer reviewed articles, grey literature (books, discussion papers, posters et cetera). Studies of summative peer assessment, instrument development, and systematic reviews were excluded. We incorporated several similar terms related to peer assessment in the search to ensure that no studies were missed (Appendix 1). Furthermore, we consulted a well-versed librarian with experience of systematic search²⁶ to assist us systematically identify relevant search terms in each database, control the relevance of the constructed search blocks, and manage the data in a reference management system.

150 Study selection

The process of the study selection and the reasons for exclusion are presented in a flow
 diagram²⁷ (Figure 1). First, the first author (MS) screened all 1,452 titles. Second, MS read all
 the abstracts, gave those responding to the research questions a unique code, and organized

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Page 7 of 30

BMJ Open

them in a reference management system. An additional hand search of reference lists was conducted. To cover a subject in full, a scoping review should include search in grey literature.^{22 23} Therefore, the grey literature was scoped to find unpublished results by searching Google Scholar, LibSearch, and Science Direct. The grey literature mostly contained research posters, conference abstracts, discussion papers, and books, but a hand search revealed original research articles that were added for further screening and appraisal. Finally, the first author (MS) arrived at 81 studies, read them in full-text, and discussed them with the other three authors (EC, MB, EM).

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

163 Charting the data

We constructed a charting form to facilitate the screening of the full-text studies (Appendix 2). Out of the 81 studies, 37 met the inclusion criteria and were appraised for quality using Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP).²⁸ To investigate the interpretation of the quality instrument, three members of the research team (MS, EM, EC) conducted an initial test assessment of two randomly selected studies and graded them with high, moderate, or low quality. Additional screening tools were used for studies with a mixed methods design²⁹ and cross-sectional studies³⁰ not available in CASP. When a discrepancy arose, a fourth researcher (MB) assessed the articles independently without prior knowledge of what the others have concluded. This was followed by a discussion among all four researchers to secure internal agreement on how to further interpret the checklist items and quality assessment. Consequently, to ensure high quality, the studies had to have a "yes" answer for a majority of the questions. If "no" dominated, the study was excluded. Since earlier reports³¹ have raised and discussed the importance of ethical issues in systematic reviews, all screening protocols in this review included ethical considerations, as an individual criterion. The first author critically appraised all 37 articles, and 15 articles were divided between the team members (EC, MB, EM) and independently appraised. The screening process was conducted using the Rayyan system for systematic reviews, presented by Ouzzani et al.³² The critical appraisal resulted in 18 studies with high and moderate quality (Table 2).

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

- **INSERT TABLE 2 HERE**
- 184 Collating, summarizing, and reporting results

The analysis process followed the five phases of thematic analysis described by Braun and
 Clarke,³³ with support of a practical guide provided by Maquire & Delahunt.³⁴ The first phase

includeed familiarizing with the data. Therefore, prior to the coding process, we read all the articles to grasp a first impression of the results presented within the included studies. We then conducted a theoretical thematic analysis, meaning that the results were deductively coded,³³ guided by the research questions. We read the results a second time before starting the initial coding. The codes consisted of short descriptions close to the original text. The codes were then combined into themes and sub-themes. The themes were identified with a semantic approach, meaning that they were explicit: we did not look for anything beyond what was written.33 Finally, we constructed a thematic map to present an overview of the results and how they related to each other. The results from the studies are presented narratively.

197 Consultation

Consultation is an optional stage in scoping reviews.²² However, since it adds methodologic rigor,²³ we presented and discussed the preliminary results and the thematic map with nine academic teachers, experts within the field of healthcare education and pedagogy. The purpose of the consultation was to enhance the validity of the results of the scoping review and to facilitate appropriate dissemination of outputs.³³ The expert group responded to four questions: Do the themes make sense? Is too much data included in one single theme? Are the themes distinct or do they overlap? Are there themes within themes?³⁴ The consultation resulted in a revision of a few themes and the way they related to each other.

39 207 **RESULTS**

The 18 included studies were published between 2002 and 2017 in the United States (6), the United Kingdom (6), Australia (3), Canada (2), and the United Arab Emirate (1) (Table 3). The studies were conducted in undergraduate medical (12), dental (2), nursing (2), occupational therapy (1), and radiography (1) educations. Six studies were presented in the framework of an existing collaborative educational model.^{35-37 38 39 40} Our review revealed that the most frequent setting for formative peer assessment activities is within clinical skill-training courses,^{35 39-47} involving intra-professional peers. The common rationale for using formative peer assessment is to support students, usually explained by the inherent learning of the feedback process, 35 39 40 43-45 47-51 and to prepare students for professional behavior and provide them with the skills required in the health care professions.^{36 37 38 46 47 48 49 52} Table 3 presents the results of the analysis related to the research questions of context, rationale, and interventions of formative peer assessment.

1 2		
3 ⊿	220	
5	221	INSERT TABLE 3 HERE
6 7	222	
8 9	223	The results related to the research questions about the experience of students and teachers
10	224	and the outcome of formative peer assessment interventions fall within three themes: (1)
12	225	the organization and structure of peer assessment activities, (2) personal attributes and
13 14	226	consequences for oneself and one's peer relationships, and (3) the experience and
15 16	227	outcome of feedback and learning.
17 18 19	228	The organization and structure of formative peer assessment activities
20	229	In the reviewed studies, students express viewing the responsibility of faculty as a key
21 22	230	component in formative peer assessment, meaning that faculty must clearly state the aim
23 24	231	of the peer assessment activity. Students highlight the need to be prepared and trained in
25 26	232	how to give and receive constructive feedback. ^{36 47 50-52} The learning activities need to be
27	233	well-designed and supported by guidelines on how to use them. ^{35 36 50 52} Otherwise, it
28 29	234	could discourage students from participating in the peer activities. ⁵² Novice students find
30 31	235	it difficult to be objective and to offer constructive criticism in a group. ^{36 46} This
32 33	236	emphasizes the importance of responsibility from faculty, especially when students are to
34	237	give feedback on professional behavior.52 Some students prefer direct communication
35 36	238	with peers when feedback is negative, whereas others think it is the responsibility of
37 38	239	faculty.52 There is some ambiguity regarding whether feedback should be given
39	240	anonymously or not, ^{47 52} whether it should bear consequences from faculty or not, ⁵²
40 41	241	whether it should be informal or formal, and whether the peer should be at the same
42 43	242	academic level or at a more experienced higher-level. ^{50 52} However, some students
44 45	243	express favoring small groups; ^{41 49} further, students in small groups show more activity
46	244	than those in large groups. ⁴¹ Students and teachers agree that peer assessment should be
47 48	245	strictly formative rather than summative. ^{42 46 52} Teachers see themselves as key facilitators
49 50	246	and express that students value feedback from teachers rather than from peers (in terms of
51 52	247	credibility).51 Students express similar sentiments even if they appreciated the peer
53	248	feedback. ^{40 42 44 46} However, teachers confirm the need for training and preparing students
54 55	249	early in the education, as well as the need for their own professional development to guide
56 57	250	students effectively. ⁵¹
58 59	251	Personal attributes and the impact and consequences for oneself and one's peer
60	252	

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Students generally focus on how peer assessment activities may affect their personal relationships in a negative way.^{35 37 42 50 52} They express worry over consequences for themselves and their social relationships^{37 40 52} as well as anxiety that negative feedback given to a peer may affect the grading from faculty.⁵² Moreover, students emphasize the importance of enthusiasm and engagement in listening to peers' opinions during their collaboration.^{36 47} They mention positive personal attributes and behaviors such as being organized, polite, and helpful as a support for peer collaboration.^{36 47} Further, they mention the importance of both a positive and close relationship between students and faculty⁵² and a positive culture in the learning environment.⁴⁰ While students highlight the impact and consequences on personal relationships, teachers speak of the importance of respect in formative peer assessment,³⁶ including respect for each other, the learning activity, and the collaboration and interaction.³⁶ Further, teachers emphasize the importance of students being self-aware, being well prepared, and taking own responsibility for the peer assessment activity.³⁶

The experience and outcome of feedback and learning

According to the students in the reviewed studies, formative peer assessment contributes to developing the skills needed in practice and in their future profession.^{35 36 40 41 48 52} They appreciate the opportunity to give and receive feedback from a peer, 35 36 40 42 47 48 50 and they agree that the feedback they received made them change how they worked^{42 48} or how they taught their peers.^{47 48} They consider activities such as observation of others' performance as beneficial for learning because they make them reflect on their own performance^{35 36 40 41 46 49 50} and help them identify knowledge gaps.^{35 40 49} Students with prior experience of peer learning are more likely to provide specific guiding feedback than those without such experiences.³⁹ Moreover, two studies showed significantly improved test results for students who took part in a peer feedback activity compared to those who did not.^{43 49} Further, students think they could be honest in their feedback and would learn better if the feedback was more in-depth.^{35 46} Students at entry level tend to give more positive feedback than senior students; they also focus on practical and clinical knowledge, whereas students in year five focus on communication, management, and leadership in their feedback comments.⁴⁵ A study exploring what students remember of received feedback shows they remember positive growth, negative self-image, and negative attitudes toward classmates. Received feedback sometimes confirmed personal traits the students already knew about.³⁷ In addition, negative feedback was more likely to

Page 11 of 30

BMJ Open

result in a change in their work habits and interpersonal attributes.³⁷ Students express some anxiety regarding the usefulness of feedback from low-performing students^{40 50} and non-motivated students, which contributes to ineffective interaction and learning.^{36 47} Low performing students showlack of initiative, preparation, and respect but also show improvement in their ratings after the peer assessment experience.⁴⁷ Furthermore, feedback from peers can be a predictor of a student's unprofessional behavior; hence, it could be used as a tool for early remediation.³⁸ In an evaluation of faculty examiners' experience of students' feedback, the faculty express they view student feedback to be given in a professional and appropriate way and faculty examiners would have given similar feedback.⁴² In an OSCE-examination where a checklist was used, the results show statistical significance in assessment between faculty examiners and student examiners.⁴²

23 297 DISCUSSION

We conclude that formative peer assessment is a process with two consecutive phases. The first phase concerns the understanding of the rationale and fundament of the peer assessment process for students and faculty members. The results indicate that the rationale is to support student learning and prepare them for healthcare professions. Nevertheless, students express the importance of clarifying the aim of the peer assessment activity and the responsibility of the faculty. We recommend faculty to clearly define the activity and explain how it supports student learning and professionalism, especially when students are to provide feedback to each other on sensitive matters, such as un-professional behavior. Otherwise, there is a risk that students might perceive peer assessment as an activity meant to ease the burden on the teachers.^{53 54} A collaborative activity requires trust, and the real intention must be made transparent. ^{4 55-57} Moreover, to enable student development in-line with the learning outcomes, the learning activity needs to be well designed and understood by students so they can advantageously relate to the purpose.^{58 59 60} However, Casey et al.⁶¹ recommended further investigations of how to prepare students for the peer assessment activities.

The second phase concerns the organization and structure of the formative peer assessment activity, for example, how to give and receive feedback. The current scoping review reveals the complexity of peer collaboration in formative peer assessment: It affects students' emotions concerning both themselves and their relationship with their peers. This coincides with earlier research emphasizing the social factors of peer assessment and the importance for teachers to consider them.⁴ Nevertheless, surprisingly, few studies highlight the collaborative

part of peer assessment.⁴¹¹ One reason might be that formative peer assessment is often presented as a "stand alone" activity and not involved in a collaborative learning environment.^{8 62} We agree with earlier research^{63 64} arguing that peer assessment needs to be affiliated with practices of collaborative learning. Similar implications are presented by Tornwall,¹⁹ who concluded the importance of integrating peer collaboration as a natural approach throughout education to support student development.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Some have argued that the research on peer assessment is deficient in referring to exactly what peer assessment aims to achieve.⁶⁵ We conclude that within healthcare education the aim of formative peer assessment is to prepare students for the collaborative aspects crucial within the healthcare professions. However, healthcare education must consider preparing and introducing students to collaborative learning; therefore, it must develop well-designed learning activities aligned with the learning outcomes. Based on this systematic scoping review, formative peer assessment needs to be implemented in a collaborative learning environment throughout the education to be effective. However, since peer collaboration seems to affect students' and teachers' experiences of formative peer assessment, empirical investigations exploring the collaboration between students are of utmost importance.

LIMITATIONS

Previous methodological concerns and discussions have been related to the systematic approach of handling grey literature.^{66 67} We argue that the grey literature contributes to a wider understanding of the research area. When we were conducting a critical appraisal of included studies, the grey literature was excluded due to lack of methodological rigor. Therefore, we recommend considering this time-consuming phase of the methodology in systematic scoping reviews. Further, the current scoping review has not fully elucidated the perspective of teachers and faculty. Few of the included studies highlight the teachers' perspective, so further research is required.

Authors' contribution: MS led the design, search strategy, and conceptualization of this work and drafted the manuscript. EM, MB, and EC were involved in the conceptualization of the review design, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and critical appraisal and provided feedback on the methodology and the manuscript. All authors give their approval to the publishing of this scoping review manuscript.

2		
3 1	351	Funding statement: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the
4 5 6	352	public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.
7 8	353	Competing interests: None declared.
9 10	354	Patient and public involvement: As this is a scoping review no primary research has been
11 12	355	conducted and thus not involve patients or the public.
13 14 15	356	Acknowledgement: Special thanks to the members in the expert group for their valuable
15 16 17	357	contribution in the consultation.
17 18 19	358	REFERENCES
20	359	1. Boud D, Cohen R, Sampson J. Peer learning and assessment. Assessment & evaluation in higher
21	360	education 1999;24(4):413-26.
23	361	2. Topping KJ, Ehly SW. Peer assisted learning: A framework for consultation. Journal of Educational
24	362	and Psychological Consultation 2001;12(2):113-32.
25	363	3. Vygotskiĭ LS. Thought and language: MIT press 2012.
26	364	4. Topping KJ. Peer Assessment. 2009:20-27. doi: 10.1080/00405840802577569
27	365	5. Dannefer EF, Henson LC, Bierer SB, et al. Peer assessment of professional competence. Medical
28	366	<i>Education</i> 2005;39(7):713-22. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02193.x
29 30	367	6. Casey D, Burke E, Houghton C, et al. Use of peer assessment as a student engagement strategy in
31	368	nurse education. <i>Nursing & health sciences</i> 2011;13(4):514-20.
32	369	7. Orsmond* P, Merry S, Callaghan A. Implementation of a formative assessment model
33	370	incorporating peer and self-assessment. Innovations in Education and Teaching International
34	371	2004;41(3):273-90.
35	372	8. Ashenafi MM. Peer-assessment in higher education – twenty-first century practices, challenges
36	373	and the way forward. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 2017;42(2):226-51. doi:
3/	374	10.1080/02602938.2015.1100711
38 20	375	9. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role
40	376	blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. <i>Journal of Interprofessional</i>
41	377	<i>care</i> 2015;29(1):20-25.
42	378	10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. <i>Journal of medical imaging and radiation</i>
43	379	sciences 2017;48(2):207-16.
44	380	11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational
45	381	model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. BMC nursing
46	382	2015;14(1):48.
47 48	383	12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review. Nurse education
49	384	today 2018;/1:266-75.
50	385	13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and
51	386	seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in higher education 2006;31(2):199-218.
52	387	14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. Advances in
53	388	physiology education 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005
54	389	15. Black P, William D. Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: principles, policy
55 56	390	& practice 1998;5(1):7-74.
57	391	16. Sadier DR. Beyond reedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. Assessment &
58	392	Evaluation in Higner Education 2010;35(5):535-50.
59	393	17. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. <i>Review of educational</i>
60	594	RESEALCH 1338,08(3).243-10.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

2		
3	395	18. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in
4	396	medical education: a systematic review. Med Teach 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi:
5	397	10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26]
6 7	398	19. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75.
/ 8	399	20. Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in
9	400	undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. BMC medical education
10	401	2019:19(1):321.
11	402	21. Khan R. Pavne MWC. Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination:
12	403	A scoping review. <i>Medical Teacher</i> 2017:39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.1309375
13	404	22. Arksey H. O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. <i>International</i>
14	405	Journal of Social Research Methodology 2005;8(1):19-32. doi:
15	406	10.1080/1364557032000119616
16	407	23. Levac D, Colguhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. Implementation
1/	408	Science 2010;5(1):69. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-5-69
19	409	24. Stenberg M, Mangrio E, Bengtsson M, et al. Formative peer assessment in healthcare education
20	410	programmes: protocol for a scoping review. BMJ open 2018;8(11):e025055-e55. doi:
21	411	10.1136/bmjopen-2018-025055
22	412	25. Peters M. Godfrey C. McInerney P. et al. Methodology for JBI scoping reviews. The Joanna Briggs
23	413	Institute Reviewers manual 2015: The Joanna Briggs Institute 2015:3-24.
24	414	26. Morris M. Boruff JT. Gore GC. Scoping reviews: establishing the role of the librarian. <i>Journal of the</i>
25	415	Medical Library Association: JMLA 2016;104(4):346.
20 27	416	27. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-
27	417	analyses: the PRISMA statement. Annals of internal medicine 2009;151(4):264-69.
29	418	28. Programme CAS. Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. CASP checklist 2018 [Available from:
30	419	https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/ accessed 5 august 2018.
31	420	29. Hong Q, Pluye P, Fàbregues S, et al. Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018: User
32	421	guide. Department of Family Medicine, McGuill Univertiy 2018
33	422	30. Institute JB. Critical Appraisal Tools [Available from: http://joannabriggs.org/research/critical-
34 25	423	appraisal-tools.html accessed 5 august 2018.
36	424	31. Weingarten MA, Paul M, Leibovici L. Assessing ethics of trials in systematic reviews. Bmj
37	425	2004;328(7446):1013-14.
38	426	32. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, et al. Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic
39	427	reviews. Systematic reviews 2016;5(1):210.
40	428	33. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative research in psychology
41	429	2006;3(2):77-101.
42	430	34. Maguire M, Delahunt B. Doing a thematic analysis: A practical, step-by-step guide for learning
43	431	and teaching scholars. AISHE-J: The All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher
44 45	432	Education 2017;9(3)
46	433	35. Cushing A, Abbott S, Lothian D, et al. Peer feedback as an aid to learning - What do we want?
47	434	Feedback. When do we want it? Now! <i>Medical Teacher</i> 2011;33(2) doi:
48	435	10.3109/0142159X.2011.542522
49	436	36. Iqbal M, Velan GM, O'Sullivan AJ, et al. Differential impact of student behaviours on group
50	437	interaction and collaborative learning: medical students' and tutors' perspectives. BMC
51	438	medical education 2016;16(1):217-17. doi: 10.1186/s12909-016-0730-1
52	439	37. Nofziger AC, Naumburg EH, Davis BJ, et al. Impact of peer assessment on the professional
53 54	440	development of medical students: a qualitative study. Academic medicine : journal of the
55	441	Association of American Medical Colleges 2010;85(1):140-47. doi:
56	442	10.1097/ACM.0b013e3181c47a5b
57	443	38. Emke AR, Cheng S, Chen L, et al. A Novel Approach to Assessing Professionalism in Preclinical
58	444	Medical Students Using Multisource Feedback Through Paired Self- and Peer Evaluations.
59	445	Teaching and learning in medicine 2017;29(4):402-10. doi: 10.1080/10401334.2017.1306446
60		

2		
3	446	39. Chou CL, Masters DE, Chang A, et al. Effects of longitudinal small-group learning on delivery and
4	447	receipt of communication skills feedback. <i>Medical Education</i> 2013;47(11):1073-79. doi:
5	448	10.1111/medu.12246
6 7	449	40. Tai JH-M, Canny BJ, Haines TP, et al. The role of peer-assisted learning in building evaluative
/ Q	450	judgement: opportunities in clinical medical education. Advances in health sciences
o Q	451	education : theory and practice 2016:21(3):659-76. doi: 10.1007/s10459-015-9659-0
10	452	41. Cho Y. Je S. Yoon YS. et al. The effect of peer-group size on the delivery of feedback in basic life
11	453	support refresher training: A cluster randomized controlled trial. BMC Medical Education
12	454	2016·16(1)·1-8. doi: 10.1186/s12909-016-0682-5
13	455	42 Moineau G. Power B. Pion A-MI, et al. Comparison of student examiner to faculty examiner
14	456	scoring and feedback in an OSCE Medical education 2011:45(2):183-91 doi: 10.1111/i.1365-
15	457	2923 2010 03800 x
16	457 158	A3 Satterthwaite ID Grey NIA Peer-group assessment of pre-clinical operative skills in restorative
17	450	45. Satter thwate JD, Grey NJA. Feel-gloup assessment of pre-clinical operative skins in restorative deptistry and comparison with experienced assessors. European Journal of Deptal Education
18	455	$2008 \cdot 12/2 \cdot 2002 \cdot 102$ doi: 10.1111/i 1600.0570.2008.00500 x
19	400	A4 Vaughe CL Kim E. O'Sullivan P. et al. Deer video review and feedback improve performance in
20	401	44. Vaugini CJ, Kini E, O Sunivan P, et al. Peer video review and reeuback improve performance in basis surgical skills. <i>Amarican Journal of Surgany</i> 2016;211(2):255–60. doi:
21	402	Dasic surgical skills. American Journal of Surgery 2010,211(2).555-60. doi.
23	403	10.1010/J.dlfljSurg.2015.08.034
24	404	45. Theory, woolford W, Escudier W. Analysis of defical students written peer recuback from a
25	465	prospective peer assessment protocol. European Journal of Denial Education 2016;20(4):241-
26	400	47. doi: 10.1111/eje.12187
27	467	46. Rees C, Sneard C, Michnerson A. Communication skills assessment: the perceptions of medical
28	468	students at the University of Nottingham. <i>Medical Education</i> 2002;36(9):868-78.
29	469	47. Spandorfer J, Puklus T, Rose V, et al. Peer assessment among first year medical students in
30	470	anatomy. Anatomical sciences education 2014;7(2):144-52. doi: 10.1002/ase.1394
31 22	471	48. Martin D, Friesen E, De Pau A. Three heads are better than one: a mixed methods study
32 33	472	examining collaborative versus traditional test-taking with nursing students. Nurse education
34	473	<i>today</i> 2014;34(6):971-77. doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2014.01.004
35	474	49. Mui Lim S, Rodger S. The use of interactive formative assessments with first-year occupational
36	475	therapy students. <i>International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation</i> 2010;17(11):576-86.
37	476	50. Elshami W, Abdalla ME. Diagnostic radiography students' perceptions of formative peer
38	477	assessment within a radiographic technique module. Radiography (London, England : 1995)
39	478	2017;23(1):9-13. doi: 10.1016/j.radi.2016.06.001
40	479	51. Koh LC. Academic staff perspectives of formative assessment in nurse education. Nurse education
41	480	in practice 2010;10(4):205-09. doi: 10.1016/j.nepr.2009.08.007
42	481	52. Arnold L, Shue CK, Kritt B, et al. Medical students' views on peer assessment of professionalism.
45 44	482	Journal of General Internal Medicine 2005;20(9):819-24. doi: 10.1111/j.1525-
45	483	1497.2005.0162.x
46	484	53. Cassidy S. Assessing 'inexperienced'students' ability to self-assess: Exploring links with learning
47	485	style and academic personal control. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education
48	486	2007;32(3):313-30.
49	487	54. Thomas G, Martin D, Pleasants K. Using self-and peer-assessment to enhance students' future-
50	488	learning in higher education. Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice
51	489	2011;8(1):5.
52	490	55. Vickerman P. Student perspectives on formative peer assessment : an attempt to deepen
53	491	learning ? 2009;34(2):221-30. doi: 10.1080/02602930801955986
54 55	492	56. Sluijsmans D, Prins F. A conceptual framework for integrating peer assessment in teacher
56	493	education. Studies in Educational Evaluation 2006;32(1):6-22.
57	494	57. Boud D, Falchikov N. Developing assessment for informing judgement. <i>Rethinking assessment in</i>
58	495	higher education: Learning for the longer term 2007:181-97.
59	496	58. Cassidy S. Developing employability skills : peer assessment in higher education. 2006 doi:
60	497	10.1108/00400910610705890
		· ·

1		
2		
3	498	59. Solheim E, Plathe HS, Eide H. Nursing students' evaluation of a new feedback and reflection tool
4	499	for use in high-fidelity simulation – Formative assessment of clinical skills. A descriptive
5	500	quantitative research design. Nurse Education in Practice 2017;27:114-20. doi:
6	501	10.1016/i.nepr.2017.08.021
/	502	60 Topping KI Peer assessment Theory into practice 2009:48(1):20-27
8	502	61 Casey D. Burke F. Houghton C. et al. Use of near assessment as a student engagement strategy in
9	505	bi. Casey D, burke L, Houghton C, et al. Ose of peer assessment as a student engagement strategy in
10	504	nurse education. Nursing and Health Sciences 2011;13(4):514-20. doi: 10.1111/j.1442-
11	505	2018.2011.00637.x
12	506	62. Papinczak T, Young L, Groves M, et al. An analysis of peer, self, and tutor assessment in problem-
13	507	based learning tutorials. <i>Med Teach</i> 2007;29(5):e122-32. doi: 10.1080/01421590701294323
14	508	[published Online First: 2007/09/22]
15	509	63. Kollar I, Fischer F. Peer assessment as collaborative learning: A cognitive perspective. Learning
10	510	and Instruction 2010;20(4):344-48.
17	511	64. Finn GM. Garner J. Twelve tips for implementing a successful peer assessment. <i>Medical teacher</i>
10	512	2011:33(6):443-46
20	513	65 Jackel B. Pearce I. Radloff A. et al. Assessment and feedback in higher education
20	515	66. Contlos SL Lokker C. McKibbon KA. Health information technology to facilitate communication
21	514	bo. Genties SJ, Lokker C, Michibbon KA. Health information technology to facilitate communication
22	515	involving health care providers, caregivers, and pediatric patients: a scoping review. Journal
23	516	of medical Internet research 2010;12(2):e22.
25	517	67. Pham MT, Rajić A, Greig JD, et al. A scoping review of scoping reviews: advancing the approach
26	518	and enhancing the consistency. <i>Research synthesis methods</i> 2014;5(4):371-85.
27		
28	519	
29		
30	520	
31		
32	521	
33	521	
34		
35	522	
36		
37	523	
38		
39	524	
40		
41	525	
42	525	
43		
44	526	
45		
46	527	
47	527	
48		
49	528	
50		
51	529	
52		
53	530	
54	550	
55		
56	531	
5/		
50 50	532	
22		
00		

[Population	Concept	Context
	Students assessing students	Intervention, rationale, outcome, context, and students' and teachers' experience of formative peer assessment	Healthcare education programs in higher education
535			
536			
537			
538			
520			
540			
541			
542			
542			
542 543			
542 543 544			
542 543 544 545			
542 543 544 545 546			
542 543 544 545 546			
542 543 544 545 546 547			
542 543 544 545 546 547 548			
 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 			
542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549			
542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550			
542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551			
542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551			
542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551			

1 4 4 4 1 0 0 1 3 0

able 2. Quantian of inc	luded studios		BMJ Open	6/bmjopen-2020-C by copyright, inc	
Author, year, country, and journal	Aim	Design	Participants	Main findings for On	Quality
Arnold et al., 2005, ⁵² USA Journal of General Internal Medicine	Identify factors that encourage or discourage student participation in peer assessment	Qualitative Grounded theory Focus groups (16) at two medical schools	n=61, medical students in year 1, 3, and 4	The characteristics of the peer Assessment system and the environment con encourage or discourage participation Themes: (1) Students' struggle with prevare system, (2) Characteristics of a peer constrained by the system, and (3) Environmental factors	moderat
Cho et al., 2016, ⁴¹ England <i>BMC Medical</i> <i>Education</i>	Investigate the effect of peer- group size on competency- based skills	Quantitative Cluster RCT	n=115, medical students in year 6	Smaller groups (4.1) show the active and preferred than large groups (8.1). Group size did not impact score and at o de at o de min from the score at the score a	high
Chou et al., 2013, ³⁹ USA <i>Medical Education</i>	Examine the role of prior peer-learning relationships between students in their delivery and receipt of feedback on clinical communication skills	Mixed method Case-control Descriptive statistics Survey, video observations	n= 72 medical students in year 3 with prior peer learning relationships n=36 students in control group with no prior peer relationships.	Students with prior peer Barning relationships more likely to previde specific corrective feedback than hose without prior relationships. No significant difference between groups regarding hove feedback was received.	moderat
Cushing et al., 2011, ³⁵ United Kingdom <i>Medical Teacher</i>	Investigate the benefits of formative peer feedback in communication skills and develop a training programme in peer feedback	Mixed method Questionnaire (20 items) at two occasions with 6 months in between. Focus groups (5 medical- and 2 nurse students)	n=45 medical students in year 1 n=48 nursing students in year 1	Students valued the learning deportunity of both being examiner and beserver. They preferred more in-depth Bedback and feedback from tutors. They expressed anxiety about giving negative geedback to a peer and had mixed view on giving feedback (relaxed or pressure) and its use in clinical placements.	high
Elshami & Abdalla, 2017, ⁵⁰ United Arab Emirates <i>Radiography</i>	Assess perception of formative peer assessment	Qualitative Action research Focus groups (3) Content analysis	n=19 (24**) diagnostic radiography students in year 3	Formative peer assessment gives valuable feedback from same lever or re- experienced peers. Need for training and detailed rubrics.	moderate
Emke et al., 2017, ³⁸ USA	Demonstrate that perceptual errors related to professionalism behaviors can be detected early through	Quantitative	n=246 medical students in year 2	Multiple peer assessments and feedback a tool predictor of unprofession behavior.	moderate
			17	IZ-LTA	

			ореп	тјор	
				en-2020 rright, i	
Teaching and Learning in Medicine	repeated multisource feedback			ncluding	
Iqbal et al., 2016, ³⁶ Australia <i>BMC Medical</i> <i>Education</i>	Explore students' and tutors' perception of key collaborative behaviors that impact collaborative learning and interaction	Qualitative Focus groups (5) with students Interviews (8) with teachers Thematic analysis	n= 22 medical students in year one and two n= 8 teachers	Being respectful, giving Bonst Lictive feedback, and being engaged and prepared had positive impact on both learning and group interaction. Passiveness unreliability, irresponsibility, and condescending attitudes and a negative impact on learning and incertagion. Similar results from teachers.	hi
Koh, 2010, ⁵¹ United Kingdom Nurse Education in Practice	Explore how academic staff experience, understand, and interpret the process of formative assessment and feedback of theoretical assessment	Qualitative Phenomenology Semi-structured interviews (22) Thematic analysis	n=20 academic staff in nurse education	Teachers see themselves as the facilitators and think students prefer the facilitators Students are assumed to have the skill to peer assess and give feetback out are unprepared and need support and introduction early in education. Teachers need professional development themselves.	m
Mui Lim & Rodger, 2010. ⁴⁹ Australia International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation	Improve students learning through interactive formative assessment and student generated questions	Mixed methods Cohort study Evaluation questionnaire	n= 115 occupational therapy students in year 1 in 2009 compared with n= 98 students in 2008	Significant improvement in exams result from being part of intera version to the second secon	m
Martin, Friesen, & De Pau, 2014, ⁴⁸ Canada <i>Nurse Education</i> <i>Today</i>	Examine collaborative testing versus traditional test taking with undergraduate nursing students in a nine-station OSCE	Mixed method Cross over design Survey Focus groups	n=70 nursing students	Significantly higher scores in sollaborative testing than in traditional setting. Themes: (1) studying mode studying differently, (2)/ cognitive collectivism (3), "it stuck in my head better" (4, confidence, and (5) practicing how to have knowledge and negotiate.	mo
Moineau et al., 2011, ⁴² Canada <i>Medical Education</i>	Compare scores and experiences of formative assessment from faculty and senior students during OSCE- examinations	Quantitative Cross sectional Pre- and post- questionnaire	n=66 medical students in year 2 n=27 year 4 student examiners n=27 teaching doctors	Students (year 4) assessing students (year 2) with checklists in OSCE-examinations equally assessed compared to the culty members. A positive learning expressed from both students and faculty.	m
Nofziger et al., 2010, ³⁷	Investigate the impact of peer assessment on future	Qualitative	n=70 medical students in year 2	67% found peer assessment he pful, reassuring, or confirming something they	m
			18	EZ-L1	

		BMJ Open	/bmjoper yy copyri	
			2020 ght, ir	
professional development and students' experiences	Questionnaire and narrative comments Frequency count	n=48 in year 4	knew; 65% reported impertance transformations in awareness, stitudes, or behaviors because of per assessment. Change was more likely where feedback was specific and described an area for improvement.	
Explore students' perceptions of communication skill assessment	Qualitative Focus groups	n=7 medical students in year 1 n= 7 in year 2 n=10 in year 3 n= 5 in year 4 n=3 in year 5	Year 4 and 5 more positive then younger students. Opportunities the management communication skills with the state of the level. Learning experience the state of the assessor. No constructive conticities from peers. Difficult to be objective and to give feedback.	high
Investigate if any differences existed between marks given by a peer group and those given by experienced assessors	Quantitative Cross sectional	n=65 dental students	No significant difference experienced examiners and per group.	moderat
Determine whether peer assessment improves students work habits and interpersonal attributes and whether it is accepted by students, focusing on low performing students	Multi-methods Paired sample t-test Pearson correlation coefficients Survey- content analysis	n=267 medical students in year 1; follow-up in year 2	Significant improvement ifter on-line peer feedback between test 1 and 29 Themes: (1) Initiative, (2) Communication, (3) Respect, (4) Preparation, and (5) Focus. Students prefer anonymous feedback from peers.	modera
Investigate students' experience of peer-assisted learning.	Mixed methods Ethnographic Survey, observations, and interviews Thematic analysis	n=10 medical students in year 1 (observed) n=191 students in year 3 (survey)	Observing and giving feedback to peers contributed to learning, but students value feedback from teachers for validation. Students want to preserve social relationships with peers; therefore, feedback is not so constructive Peers provide a supportive learning invironment.	high
Analyze written feedback provided as a part of a formative and structured peer assessment protocol.	Multi-methods Descriptive statistic Thematic analysis	n=40 dental students in year 2 in pre-clinical skills laboratory n=68 dental students in	Year 2 focuses on practical and clinical knowledge; in contrast, year Socuses comments on communication management, and leadership. Year 2 gives nore positive comments on peer performance than year 5.	moderat
	professional development and students' experiences Explore students' perceptions of communication skill assessment Investigate if any differences existed between marks given by a peer group and those given by experienced assessors Determine whether peer assessment improves students work habits and interpersonal attributes and whether it is accepted by students, focusing on low performing students Investigate students' experience of peer-assisted learning. Analyze written feedback provided as a part of a formative and structured peer assessment protocol.	professional development and students' experiencesQuestionnaire and narrative comments Frequency countExplore students' perceptions of communication skill assessmentQualitative Focus groupsInvestigate if any differences existed between marks given by a peer group and those given by experienced assessorsQuantitative Cross sectionalDetermine whether peer assessment improves students work habits and interpersonal attributes and whether it is accepted by students, focusing on low performing studentsMulti-methods Paired sample t-test Paired sample t-test Paired sample t-test Paired sample t-test Survey- content analysisInvestigate students' experience of peer-assisted learning.Mixed methods Ethnographic Survey, observations, and interviews Thematic analysisAnalyze written feedback provided as a part of a formative and structured peer assessment protocol.Multi-methods Descriptive statistic Thematic analysis	BMJ Openprofessional development and students' experiencesQuestionnaire and narative comments Frequency countn=48 in year 4Explore students' perceptions of communication skill assessmentQualitative Focus groupsn=7 medical students in year 1 n=7 in year 2 n=10 in year 3 n=5 in year 4 n=3 in year 5Investigate if any differences existed between marks given by a peer group and those given by experienced assessorsQuantitative Cross sectionaln=65 dental studentsDetermine whether peer assessment improves students work habits and interpersonal attributes and whether it is accepted by students, focusing on low performing studentsMulti-methods Paired sample t-test Pearson correlation coefficients Survey- content analysisn=267 medical students in year 1; follow-up in year 2 2Investigate students' experience of peer-assisted learning.Mixed methods Ethnographic Survey, observations, and interviews Thematic analysisn=10 medical students in year 1 (observed) n=191 students in year 3 (survey)Analyze written feedback provided as a part of a formative and structured peer assessment protocol.Multi-methods Descriptive statistic Thematic analysisn=40 dental students in year 2 in pre-clinical skills laboratory	BMU Open BMU Open By open professional development and students' experiences Questionnaire and narrative comments Frequency count n=48 in year 4 knew; 65% reported impertance transformations in awareBases sement. Change was more likely after geedback was specific and described an area for improvement. Explore students' perceptions of communication skill assessment Qualitative Focus groups n=7 medical students in year 1 Year 4 and 5 more positive thin younger students. Opportunities is the part of communication skill apper from same level. Learning experience assessment improves students work habits and interpersonal attributes and whether it is accepted by students, focusing on low performing students. Quantitative focus sectional n=65 dental students in year 1; follow-up in year 2 No significant difference existed between marks given by a per group and those given by experienced assessors No significant difference feedback. No significant difference existed between marks given by a per group and those given by experienced assessors No significant difference feedback. No significant difference existed between test 1 analysis No significant difference feedback from teachers and percenter is the part of the percenter and interpresent Determine whether per assessment improves students work habits and whether it is accepted by students, fromative and whether it is accepted by students, fromative and whether it is accepted by students, fromative and students' experience of peer-assisted learning. Multi-methods percentational students percepreassisted ethests Nester anonymous feebback fro

 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 21 of 30				BMJ Open	d by copyright,	6/bmjopen-20	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Vaughn et al., 2016, ⁴⁴ USA <i>The American Journal</i> of Surgery	Evaluate the use, quality, and quantity of peer video feedback and compare peers and faculty feedback.	Quantitative Cross sectional Paired t-test, Mann- Whitney statistic Survey	n=24 medical students***	Significant change in per periods in both groups. Per performed better at final faculty feedback group (Peers gave higher scores T significant differences was checklist.	bring ice across 3 er fudback group ssessment than bt significant). han faculty. No en uning a	moderate
10	*High equals majority of	items in the critical appraisal too	ls.		ate	ary Era:	
11	**24 students included in	the intervention, and 19 attended	the focus group session.		č	202 Smu	
12	***12 students received t	faculty feedback and 12 students	received neer feedback		o tej	1. D	
14	12 students received h	laculty feedback, and 12 students	received peer recuback.		t ar	oges	
15					אר מ	nloa	
16 17					ata		
18						. I fro	
19					ing	. 3	
20					, ≥I	t t t t t t t t t t t t t t t t t t t	
21					trai	//bn	
23					ning	. jog	
24					ų a	ben.	
25					nds	- B	
20 27							
28					lar	Ę	
29					tech	on N	
30					out	hay	
31 32					logi	14,	
33					es.	202	
34						25 a	
35						rt D	
36						epa	
3/ 20						rtm	
30						ent	
40						GE	
41						:Z-L	
42				20		-TA	
43		For a	peer review only - http	://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/	about/guidelines.xhtml	-	
44							

36/bmjopen-2020-045345 on 9 Fe

BMJ Open Table 3. Overview and summery of the context, rationale, and interventions of formative peer assessment presented in the included studies.

Contexts	Rationales	Interventions
Intra-professional students (17)*	Giving and receiving feeback supports student learning:	Introduction (in workshops):
Combination of medical and nursing	Promotes learning (8)	Preparations in giving and received Reedback (3)
students (1)	Enhances critical thinking (1)	Introduction of guidelines or checklists to guide the peer assessor (3)
	Promotes understanding of the assessment process (1)	Introduction of the learning active $\nabla \mathcal{D}$
Conducted in the following:	Develops critical- and interpersonal skills (1)	Preparation in communication $\mathbf{\hat{\mu}}$
Clinical skill labs (11)	Helps identify knowledge gaps (1)	nd
Theoretical courses (7)	Supports low-performance students (1)	Learning activities focusing fe
Combination of theoretical and		Clinical skills (3)
clinical placement course (1)	It prepares students for knowledge-related professionalism in	Collaborative behavior (2) $\mathbf{B} : \mathbf{H}$
•	the healthcare profession by helping them identify the	Clinical reasoning (2)
	following:	Theoretical knowledge (2)
Within an educational model as	Professional- and un-professional behavior (6)	Communication skills (2) $\mathbf{\bar{b}}$
problem-based learning, peer learning,	Clinical competence (2)	Management skills (1)
or peer assisted learning (7)	Technical skills (2)	
	Communication skills (2)	Feedback types:
	Collaborative behavior (2)	Face-to-face (7)
	Evaluative judgement (1)	Anonymous (5)
		Written (3) or through observations (3)
	It enhances teachers' teaching (1)	Interactive on-line assessment (2)
		Grading of the given feedback \overrightarrow{a}
	It provides cost benefits:	
	Students as assessors instead of teachers (2)	Random peers (8)
	Students as creators of the learning activities instead of	Ability to choose peer (1) $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{z}$
	teachers (1)	In small groups $\leq 6(6)$
		In large groups $\geq 6(3)$
* = appears in how many of the included	18 studies	
TT ST ST ST		5
		at
		De
		To a
		7
		Пе
		at a statement of the s
		<u>ତ</u>
		ËN-
	21	Ξ.
	L 1	\triangleright

2 3 4	
5	
7	
8	
10	
11	
13	
14	
15 16	
17	
18 19	
20	
21	
23	
24	
25	
27	
28 29	
30	
31 32	
33	
34 35	
36	
37 38	
39	
40 41	
42	
43	
44 45	
46	
47 48	
49	
50 51	
52	
53 54	
55	

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml





3
4
5
6
7
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
17
10
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
20
57
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
16
40
4/
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
50
5/
58
59
60

Appendix 1. Presentation of the search strategy and results from the Pub Med database (2019-05-28).

	Search block 1: Healthcare education
#	MESH-terms
1	"Students, Medical"[Mesh] OR
2	"Students, Nursing"[Mesh] OR
3	"Students, Dental"[Mesh] OR
4	"Students, Health Occupations"[Mesh] OR
5	"Education. Medical"[Mesh] OR
6	"Education Nursing"[Mesh] OR
7	"Education, Dental" [Mesh] OR
8	"Midwiferv/education"[Mesh] OR
9	"Allied Health Personnel/education"[Mesh]
-	
10	S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4 OR S5 OR S6 OR S7 OR S8
	OR S9
#	Free text terms
11	"medical student*" OR
12	"nursing student*" OR
13	"midwifery student* OR
14	"dental student*" OR
15	"physical therapy student*" OR
16	"occupational therapy student*" OR
17	"allied health student*" OR
18	"health occupations student*" OR
19	"health care stud*" OR
20	"Health care education" OR
21	"health science education" OR
22	"Medical education" OR
23	"Nursing education" OR
24	"Dental education" OR
25	"allied health education" OR
26	"Health occupation* education*" OR
27	"midwifery education"
28	S11 OR S12 OR S13 OR S14 OR S15 OR S16 OR S17
20	OP \$18 OP \$10 OP \$20 OP \$21 OP \$22 OP \$23 OP
	S24 OR S25 OR S26 OR S27
20	\$10 OR \$28
2)	510 OK 520
	Search block 2: Peer assessment
#	MESH
31	"Educational Measurement"[Mesh] OR
32	"Peer Group"[Mesh] OR
33	"Peer Review"[Mesh]
24	
34 #	531 UK 532 UK 533
75	"neer assessment" OP
36	"neer evaluation" OR
30	"neer observation" OR
38	"peer feedback" OR
30	"peer review" OP
40	"peer assass" OP
40	"*neer assess" OR
12	"neer examiner" OR
12	"neer grad*" OR
43	"peer group" OR

- 45 "Student performance appraisal" OR46 "educational measurement"
- 47
 S35 OR S36 OR S37 OR S38 OR S39 OR S40 OR S41 OR S42 OR S43 OR S44 OR S45 OR S46

 48
 S34 OR S47



	Search block 3: Formative assessment	
#	MESH	
49	"Formative Feedback"[Mesh]	
#	Free text terms	
50	"Formative evaluation" OR	
51	"Formative feedback" OR	
52	"Formative assessment" OR	
53	"Formative* assess*" OR	
54	"Formativ* evaluation" OR	
55	Formativ* OR	
56	"formative evaluation research"	
57	S37 OR S38 OR S39 OR S40 OR S41 OR S42 OR S43	
58	S49 OR S57	
11		
#	Combination of search blocks 1, 2, and 3	
59	S29 AND S48 AND S58	

#	Combination of search blocks 1, 2, and 3
59	S29 AND S48 AND S58

Appendix 2. Charting form
CHARTING FORM
ARTICLE NO:
TITLE:
AUTHOR/S:
YEAR OF PUBLICATION:
<u>COUNTRY:</u>
RESEARCH DESIGN: QUANTITATIVE QUALITATIVE OTHER:
O
METHOD:
<u>AIM:</u>
NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS (n=):
<u>SETTING:</u>
MEDICAL EDUCATION
NURSING EDUCATION
MIDWIFERY EDUCATION
PHYSIOTHERAPY EDUCATION
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY
DENTAL EDUCATION
OTHER

3
4
5
6
7
, 8
0
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
10
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
25
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
3/
24 25
22
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
42
7-J 1-J
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
52
22
54
55
56
57
58
59
~ ~

DOES THE STUDY PRESENT?			
HOW PEER ASSESSEMENT	YES	NO	
INTERVENTIONS ARE DELIVERED			
PEER ASSESSMENT	YES	NO	
FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT	YES	NO	
STUDENTS EXPERIENCE	YES	NO	
TEACHERS EXPERIENCE	YES	NO	OTHER:
OUTCOME/S OF PEER ASSESSMENT	YES	NO	
INTERVENTION			
RATIONALE/S FOR PEER ASSESSMENT	YES	NO	
INTERVENTION			
MAIN FINDINGS:			
INCLUDED:	YES	NO	
REASON/S FOR EXCLUSION:			



Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist

	SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #				
I	TITLE	TITLE						
	Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	1				
	ABSTRACT							
	Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	2				
	INTRODUCTION							
	Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	3, 4				
	Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	5,16				
	METHODS							
	Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	4				
	Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	5				
	Information sources*	7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	5, 23				
	Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	23				
	Selection of sources of evidence†	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	5, 6				
	Data charting process‡	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	5,6, 25,26,27				
	Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	7,16,22				
	Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence§	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	6,18,19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27				



St. Michael's

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	6,7
RESULTS			
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	5,6,17
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	7,8,9,10
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	18,19,20,21
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	7,8,9,10
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	22
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	10
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	11
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	11
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	12

JBI = Joanna Briggs Institute; PRISMA-ScR = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews.

* Where *sources of evidence* (see second footnote) are compiled from, such as bibliographic databases, social media platforms, and Web sites.

† A more inclusive/heterogeneous term used to account for the different types of evidence or data sources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy documents) that may be eligible in a scoping review as opposed to only studies. This is not to be confused with *information sources* (see first footnote).
 ‡ The frameworks by Arksey and O'Malley (6) and Levac and colleagues (7) and the JBI guidance (4, 5) refer to the

[‡] The frameworks by Arksey and O Malley (6) and Levac and colleagues (7) and the JBI guidance (4, 5) refer to the process of data extraction in a scoping review as data charting.

§ The process of systematically examining research evidence to assess its validity, results, and relevance before using it to inform a decision. This term is used for items 12 and 19 instead of "risk of bias" (which is more applicable to systematic reviews of interventions) to include and acknowledge the various sources of evidence that may be used in a scoping review (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy document).

From: Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. Ann Intern Med. ;169:467–473. doi: 10.7326/M18-0850

Formative Peer Assessment in Higher Healthcare Education Programs – a Scoping Review

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-045345.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Nov-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Stenberg, Marie; Malmö Universitet, Care Science Mangrio, Elisabeth; Malmö Universitet, Care Science; Malmö Universitet, Malmö Institute for Studies of Migration, Diversity and Welfare Bengtsson, Mariette; Malmö Universitet, Care Science Carlson, Elisabeth; Malmö Universitet, Care Science
Primary Subject Heading :	Medical education and training
Secondary Subject Heading:	Medical education and training
Keywords:	MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING, EDUCATION & TRAINING (see Medical Education & Training), Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies



Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

ו ר		
2		
2 2	1	
- 5		
6	2	
7		
8	З	
9	5	
10		
11	4	Formative Peer Assessment in Higher Healthcare Education Programs – a
12	_	
13	5	Scoping Review
14		
15	6	
16	Ū.	
17		
18	7	
19		
20	8	Marie Stenberg ¹ RN: MNSc marie.stenberg@mau.se
21	C	indire stelle erg in , in the <u>interest of <u>a</u>C interest of the stelle stelle of the stelle stelle</u>
22	0	Elizabeth Manarial DN DhD Associate Drafesson elizabeth monoria Orney of
23	9	Elisabeth Mangrio ¹ KN, PhD, Associate Professor <u>elisabeth.mangrio@mau.se</u>
24 25		
25	10	Mariette Bengtsson ¹ RN, PhD, Associate Professor mariette.bengtsson@mau.se
20		
28	11	Elisabeth Carlson ¹ RN_PhD_Professor elisabeth carlson@mau.se
29		
30	4.2	
31	12	
32		
33	13	
34		
35	14	¹ Department of Care Science, Faculty of Health and Society, Malmö
36		
3/	15	University, SE 205 06 Sweden
38		
39 40	16	Corresponding author: Marie Stenberg, Faculty of Health and Society, Jan Waldenströmsg
40 //1		
42	17	25, Malmö University, SE 214 28 Malmö, Sweden
43		
44	18	Tel: +46 40 665 79 44
45	20	
46		
47	19	E-Mail: <u>marie.stenberg(a)mau.se</u>
48		
49	20	Word count: 3736
50		
51	21	
52	21	
53	22	
54	22	
55		
56	23	
57		
58	24	
59 60		
00		
1 2		
----------------	----	---
2 3 4	25	ABSTRACT
5 6	26	Objectives: Formative peer assessment focus learning and development of the student
7 8	27	learning process. This implies students taking responsibility for assessing the work of their
9	28	peers by giving and receiving feedback to each other. The aim was to compile research about
10 11	29	formative peer assessment presented in higher healthcare education, focusing the rationale,
12 13	30	the interventions, the experiences of students and teachers and the outcomes of formative
14 15	31	assessment interventions.
16 17	32	Design: A scoping review.
19	33	Data sources: Searches were conducted until May 2019 in PubMed, CINAHL, ERIC, and
20 21 22	34	ERC. Grey literature were searched in Lib-search, Google Scholar and Science Direct.
22 23 24	35	Eligibility criteria: Studies addressing formative peer assessment in higher education,
25	36	focusing medicine, nursing, midwifery, dentistry, physical or occupational therapy, and
26 27 28	37	radiology published in peer reviewed articles or in grey literature.
28 29	38	Data extractions and synthesis: Out of 1452 studies, 37 met the inclusion criteria and were
30 31	39	critically appraised. The critical appraisal resulted in 18 included studies with high and
32 33	40	moderate quality. The pertinent data was analyzed using thematic analysis.
34 35	41	Result: The results present clinical skill-training courses to be a frequent setting for
36 37	42	formative peer assessment activities, focusing intra-professional peers. The rationale for
38	43	using formative peer assessment relates to giving and receiving constructive feedback as a
39 40	44	means to promote learning. The experience and outcome of formative peer assessment
41 42	45	interventions from the perspective of students and teachers is presented within three
43	46	themes; 1/organization and structure of the formative peer assessment activities, 2/
44 45	47	personal attributes and consequences for one self and relationships and 3/ experience and
46 47	48	outcome of feedback and learning.
40 49 50	49	Conclusion: Healthcare education must consider preparing and introducing students to
51	50	collaborative learning and thus develop of well-designed learning activities aligned with the
52 53	51	learning outcomes. Since peer collaboration seems to affect students' and teachers'
54 55	52	experiences of formative peer assessment empirical investigations exploring collaboration
56 57	53	between students is of utmost importance.
57 58 59	54	Keywords: Feedback, formative assessment, healthcare education, peer assessment, students,
60	55	teachers

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

1 2		
2 3	56	
4 5		
6	57	
7 8	58	
9		
10 11	59	STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY
12 13	60	• The current scoping review is previously presented in a published study protocol.
14 15	61	• Four databases were systematically searched to identify research on formative peer
15 16	62	assessment
17 18	02	
19	63	• Critical appraisal tools were used to assess the quality of studies with quantitative,
20 21	64	qualitative, and mixed methods designs.
22	65	 Articles appraised with high or moderate quality were included.
23 24	66	• Since only English studies were included, studies may have been missed that would
25	67	otherwise have met the inclusion criteria.
26 27	68	
28	69	BACKGROUND
29 30		
31 32	70	Peer assessment is an educational approach where feedback, communication, reflection, and
33	71	collaboration between peers are key characteristics. In a peer assessment activity, students
34 35	72	take responsibility for assessing the work of their peers by giving (and receiving) feedback on
36	73	a specific subject. ¹ It allows students to consider the learning outcomes for peers of similar
38	74	status and to reflect upon their own learning mirrored in a peer. ² Peer assessment has shown
39 40	75	to support students' development of judgement skills, critiquing abilities, and self-awareness
41 42	76	as well as their understanding of the assessment criteria used in a course. ¹ In higher education,
43	77	peer assessment has been a way to move from an individualistic and teacher-led approach to a
44 45	78	more collaborative, student-centred approach to assessment ¹ aligned with social
46 47	79	constructivism principles. ³ In this social context of interaction and collaboration, students can
48 40	80	expand their knowledge, identify their strengths and weaknesses, and develop personal and
49 50	81	professional skills ⁴ by evaluating the professional competence of a peer. ⁵ Peer assessment can
51 52	82	be used in academic and professional settings as a strategy to enhance students' engagement
53	83	in their own learning. ⁶⁷⁸ The collaborative aspect of peer assessment relates to professional
54 55	84	teamwork, as well as to broader goals for lifelong learning. As argued by Boud et al., ¹ peer
56 57	85	assessment addresses course-specific goals not readily developed otherwise. For healthcare
58	06	professions, it anhances shility to work in a team in a supportive and respectful stragghere 9
59 60	00	processions, it enhances ability to work in a team in a supportive and respective autosphere,
	87	which is highly relevant for patient outcome and the reduction of errors for patient safety. ¹⁰

Page 5 of 31

BMJ Open

However, recent research has shown that peer collaboration is challenging¹¹ and that healthcare professionals are not prepared to deliver and receive feedback effectively.¹² This emphasizes the importance for healthcare educators to support students with activities fostering these competences. Feedback is highly associated with enhancing student learning¹³ and modifying learning during the learning process¹⁴ so students can close the gap between their present state of learning and their desired goal(s). Peer feedback can be written or oral, conducted as peer observations in small or large groups.⁸ Further, it is driven by set assessment criteria,¹ which can be either summative or formative, formal or informal. Summative assessment evaluates students' success or failure after the learning process,¹⁵ whereas formative assessment aims for improvement during the learning process.^{16,4} According to Black and Wiliam,¹⁵ formative peer assessment activities involve feedback to modify the teaching and learning of the students. The intention of feedback is to help students help each other when planning their learning.⁴¹⁷ An informal formative peer assessment activity involves a continuous process throughout a course or education, whereas a formal one is designated to a single point in a course's momentum. Earlier research on peer assessment in healthcare education has provided an overview of specific areas within the peer assessment process. For example, Speyer, Pilz, and Van Der Kruis presented psychometric characteristics of peer assessment instruments and questionnaires in medical education,¹⁸ concluding that quite a few instruments exist; however, these intruments mainly focus on professional behavior, and they lack sufficient psychometric data. Tornwall¹² focused on how nursing students are prepared by academics to participate in peer assessment activities and highlighted the importance of creating a supporting learning environment. Lerchenfeldt, Mi and Eng¹⁹ concluded that peer assessment supports medical students in developing professional behavior and that peer feedback is a way to assess professionalism. Khan, Payne, and Chahine²⁰ reviewed the role of peer assessment in objective structured clinical examination (OSCE), showing that peer assessment promotes learning but that students need training in how to provide feedback. In short, the existing literature contributes valuable knowledge about formative peer assessment in healthcare education targeting specific areas. However, there seems to be lack of compiled research considering formative peer assessment in its entirety, including the context, rationale, experience, and outcome of the formative peer assessment process. Therefore, this scoping review attempts to present an overview of formative peer assessment in healthcare education rather than specific areas within that process. **METHOD**

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

This scoping review was conducted using the York methodology by Arksey and O'Malley ²¹
and the recommendations presented by Levac, Colquhuan, and O'Brien.²² We constructed a
scoping protocol, utilizing a PRISMA-P protocol, to present the planned methodology for the
scoping review.²³

11 125 Aim and research questions

We aimed to compile research about formative peer assessment presented in higher healthcare education. The research questions were as follows: What are the rationales for using formative peer assessment in healthcare education? How are formative peer assessment interventions delivered in healthcare education and in what context? What experiences of formative peer assessment do students and teachers in healthcare education have? What are the outcomes of formative peer assessment interventions? We used the "Population Concept and Context" (PCC) elements recommended for scoping reviews to establish effective search criteria (Table 1).²⁴

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

135 Relevant studies identified

The literature search was conducted in the databases PubMed, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), Education Research Complete (ERIC), and Education Research Centre (ERC). Search tools such as Medical Subject Headings, Headings, Thesaurus and Boolean operators (AND/OR) helped expand and narrow the search. Initially, the search terms were broad (e.g., peer assessment or higher education) in order to capture the range of published literature. However, the extensiveness of material made it necessary to narrow the search terms and organize them in three major blocks. The following inclusion criteria were applied in the search: (a) articles addressing formative peer assessment in higher education; (b) students and teachers in medicine, nursing, midwifery, dentistry, physical or occupational therapy, and radiology; and (c) peer reviewed articles, grey literature (books, discussion papers, posters et cetera). Studies of summative peer assessment, instrument development, and systematic reviews were excluded. We incorporated several similar terms related to peer assessment in the search to ensure that no studies were missed (Appendix 1). Furthermore, we consulted a well-versed librarian with experience of systematic search²⁵ to assist us in systematically identifying relevant databases and search terms for each database. control the relevance of the constructed search blocks, and manage the data in a reference

 BMJ Open

management system. No limitation were set for year, all studies indexed in the four databaseswere included until the last search in May 28, 2019.

155 Study selection

The process of the study selection and the reasons for exclusion are presented in a flow diagram²⁶ (Figure 1). First, the first author (MS) screened all 1,452 titles. Second, MS read all the abstracts, gave those responding to the research questions a unique code, and organized them in a reference management system. The reason for inclusion and exclusion at title and abstract level was charted by the first author and critically discussed within the team (MS, EM, MB, EC). An additional hand search of reference lists was conducted. To cover a subject in full, a scoping review should include search in grey literature.^{21 22} Therefore, the grey literature was scoped to find unpublished results by searching Google Scholar, LibSearch, and Science Direct. The grey literature mostly contained research posters, conference abstracts, discussion papers, and books, but a hand search revealed original research articles that were added for further screening and appraisal. Finally, the first author (MS) arrived at 81 studies, read them in full-text, and discussed them with the other three authors (EM, MB, EC). **INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE**

Charting the data

We constructed a charting form to facilitate the screening of the full-text studies (Appendix 2). Out of the 81 studies, 37 met the inclusion criteria and were appraised for quality using Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP).²⁷ The reason for conducting a critical appraisal of the studies was to enhance the use of the findings for policy-making and practice in higher healthcare education.²⁸ To investigate the interpretation of the quality instrument, three members of the research team (MS, EM, EC) conducted an initial test assessment of two randomly selected studies and graded them with high, moderate, or low quality. Additional screening tools were used for studies with a mixed methods design²⁹ and cross-sectional studies³⁰ not available in CASP. When a discrepancy arose, a fourth researcher (MB) assessed the articles independently without prior knowledge of what the others have concluded. This was followed by a discussion among all four researchers to secure internal agreement on how to further interpret the checklist items and quality assessment. Consequently, to ensure high quality, the studies had to have a "yes" answer for a majority of the questions. If "no" dominated, the study was excluded. Since earlier reports³¹ have raised and discussed the importance of ethical issues in systematic reviews, all screening protocols in this review

BMJ Open

included ethical considerations, as an individual criterion. The first author critically appraised all 37 articles, and 15 articles were divided between the team members (EM, MB, EC) and independently appraised. Nevertheless, during the screening process all 37 articles were critically discussed using the Rayyan system for systematic reviews³² before final descision of inclusion. By this procedure, all authors were in agreement of not only which articles to include, but also the reason for exclusion. The critical appraisal resulted in 18 studies with high and moderate quality (Table 2). **INSERT TABLE 2 HERE** Collating, summarizing, and reporting results The analysis process followed the five phases of thematic analysis described by Braun and Clarke,³³ with support of a practical guide provided by Maguire & Delahunt.³⁴ The first phase includeed familiarizing with the data. Therefore, prior to the coding process, we read all the articles to grasp a first impression of the results presented within the included studies. We then conducted a theoretical thematic analysis, meaning that the results were deductively coded,³³ guided by the research questions. We read the results a second time before starting the initial coding. The codes consisted of short descriptions close to the original text. The codes were then combined into themes and sub-themes. The themes were identified with a semantic approach, meaning that they were explicit: we did not look for anything beyond what was written.³³ Finally, we constructed a thematic map to present an overview of the results and how they related to each other. The results from the studies are presented narratively. Consultation Consultation is an optional stage in scoping reviews.²¹ However, since it adds methodologic rigor,²² we presented and discussed the preliminary results and the thematic map with nine academic teachers, experts within the field of healthcare education and pedagogy. The purpose of the consultation was to enhance the validity of the results of the scoping review and to facilitate appropriate dissemination of outputs.³³ The expert group responded to four questions: Do the themes make sense? Is too much data included in one single theme? Are the themes distinct or do they overlap? Are there themes within themes?³⁴ The consultation resulted in a revision of a few themes and the way they related to each other. **RESULTS**

Page 9 of 31

1

BMJ Open

2		
3 4	218	The 18 included studies were published between 2002 and 2017 in the United States (6), the
5	219	United Kingdom (6), Australia (3), Canada (2), and the United Arab Emirate (1) (Table 3).
6 7	220	The studies were conducted in medical (12), dental (2), nursing (2), occupational therapy (1),
8 9	221	and radiography (1) educations. Six studies were presented in the framework of an existing
10	222	collaborative educational model. ^{35-37 38 39 40} Our review revealed that the most frequent setting
12	223	for formative peer assessment activities is within clinical skill-training courses, ^{35 39-47}
13 14	224	involving intra-professional peers. The common rationale for using formative peer assessment
15 16	225	is to support students, usually explained by the inherent learning of the feedback process, ^{35 39}
17	226	^{40 43-45 47-51} and to prepare students for professional behavior and provide them with the skills
18 19	227	required in the health care professions. ^{36 37 38 46 47 48 49 52} Table 3 presents the results of the
20 21	228	analysis related to the research questions of context, rationale, and interventions of formative
22	229	peer assessment.
23	230	
25 26	231	INSERT TABLE 3 HERE
27 28	232	
29	233	The results related to the research questions about the experience of students and teachers
30 31	234	and the outcome of formative peer assessment interventions fall within three themes: (1)
32 33	235	the organization and structure of peer assessment activities, (2) personal attributes and
34 35	236	consequences for oneself and one's peer relationships, and (3) the experience and
36 37	237	outcome of feedback and learning.
38 39	238	The organization and structure of formative peer assessment activities
40 41	239	In the reviewed studies, students express viewing the responsibility of faculty as a key
42 43	240	component in formative peer assessment, meaning that faculty must clearly state the aim
44 45	241	of the peer assessment activity. Students highlight the need to be prepared and trained in
46	242	how to give and receive constructive feedback. ^{36 47 50-52} The learning activities need to be
47 48 49 50	243	well-designed and supported by guidelines on how to use them. ^{35 36 50 52} Otherwise, it
	244	could discourage students from participating in the peer activities. ⁵² Novice students find
51 52	245	it difficult to be objective and to offer constructive criticism in a group. ^{36 46} This
53	246	emphasizes the importance of responsibility from faculty, especially when students are to
54 55	247	give feedback on professional behavior.52 Some students prefer direct communication
56 57	248	with peers when feedback is negative, whereas others think it is the responsibility of
58	249	faculty.52 There is some ambiguity regarding whether feedback should be given
60	250	anonymously or not, ^{47 52} whether it should bear consequences from faculty or not, ⁵²

whether it should be informal or formal, and whether the peer should be at the same academic level or at a more experienced higher-level.^{50 52} However, some students express favoring small groups;^{41 49} further, students in small groups show more activity than those in large groups.⁴¹ Students and teachers agree that peer assessment should be strictly formative rather than summative.^{42 46 52} Teachers see themselves as key facilitators and express that students value feedback from teachers rather than from peers (in terms of credibility).⁵¹ Students express similar sentiments even if they appreciated the peer feedback.^{40 42 44 46} However, teachers confirm the need for training and preparing students early in the education, as well as the need for their own professional development to guide students effectively.⁵¹

Personal attributes and the impact and consequences for oneself and one's peer relationships

Students generally focus on how peer assessment activities may affect their personal relationships in a negative way.^{35 37 42 50 52} They express worry over consequences for themselves and their social relationships^{37 40 52} as well as anxiety that negative feedback given to a peer may affect the grading from faculty.⁵² Moreover, students emphasize the importance of enthusiasm and engagement in listening to peers' opinions during their collaboration.^{36 47} They mention positive personal attributes and behaviors such as being organized, polite, and helpful as a support for peer collaboration.^{36 47} Further, they mention the importance of both a positive and close relationship between students and faculty⁵² and a positive culture in the learning environment.⁴⁰ While students highlight the impact and consequences on personal relationships, teachers speak of the importance of respect in formative peer assessment,³⁶ including respect for each other, the learning activity, and the collaboration and interaction.³⁶ Further, teachers emphasize the importance of students being self-aware, being well prepared, and taking own responsibility for the peer assessment activity.³⁶

The experience and outcome of feedback and learning

According to the students in the reviewed studies, formative peer assessment contributes to developing the skills needed in practice and in their future profession.^{35 36 40 41 48 52} They appreciate the opportunity to give and receive feedback from a peer, 35 36 40 42 47 48 50 and they agree that the feedback they received made them change how they worked^{42 48} or how they taught their peers.^{47 48} They consider activities such as observation of others'

Page 11 of 31

BMJ Open

performance as beneficial for learning because they make them reflect on their own performance^{35 36 40 41 46 49 50} and help them identify knowledge gaps.^{35 40 49} Students with prior experience of peer learning are more likely to provide specific guiding feedback than those without such experiences.³⁹ Moreover, two studies showed significantly improved test results for students who took part in a peer feedback activity compared to those who did not.^{43 49} Further, students think they could be honest in their feedback and would learn better if the feedback was more in-depth.^{35 46} Students at entry level tend to give more positive feedback than senior students; they also focus on practical and clinical knowledge, whereas students in year five focus on communication, management, and leadership in their feedback comments.⁴⁵ A study exploring what students remember of received feedback shows they remember positive growth, negative self-image, and negative attitudes toward classmates. Received feedback sometimes confirmed personal traits the students already knew about.³⁷ In addition, negative feedback was more likely to result in a change in their work habits and interpersonal attributes.³⁷ Students express some anxiety regarding the usefulness of feedback from low-performing students^{40 50} and non-motivated students, which contributes to ineffective interaction and learning.^{36 47} Low performing students showlack of initiative, preparation, and respect but also show improvement in their ratings after the peer assessment experience.⁴⁷ Furthermore. feedback from peers can be a predictor of a student's unprofessional behavior; hence, it could be used as a tool for early remediation.³⁸ In an evaluation of faculty examiners' experience of students' feedback, the faculty express they view student feedback to be given in a professional and appropriate way and faculty examiners would have given similar feedback.⁴² In an OSCE-examination where a checklist was used, the results show statistical significance in assessment between faculty examiners and student examiners.⁴²

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

307 DISCUSSION

We conclude that formative peer assessment is a process with two consecutive phases. The first phase concerns the understanding of the rationale and fundament of the peer assessment process for students and faculty members. The results indicate that the rationale is to support student learning and prepare them for healthcare professions. The formative peer assessment activities support students' reflection on their own knowledge and development when mirrored in a peer by altinating the role as being both observed and observer.^{53 54} It further contributes to skills as communication, transfer of understandable knowledge and collaboration, all significant core competences when caring for patients and their relatives.⁵⁴

BMJ Open

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

For faculty, organizing formative peer assessment, can be cost beneficial. This was recently emphasized in high volume classes expressing the reduction of costs with students giving feedback to a peer instead of teachers.⁵⁵ Nevertheless, students express the importance of clarifying the aim of the peer assessment activity and the responsibility of the faculty. We recommend faculty to clearly define the activity and explain how it supports student learning and professionalism, especially when students are to provide feedback to each other on sensitive matters, such as un-professional behavior. A collaborative activity requires trust, and the real intention must be made transparent. ^{4 56-58} Moreover, to enable student development in-line with the learning outcomes, the learning activity needs to be well designed and understood by students so they can advantageously relate to the purpose.^{59 60 61} However, Casey et al.⁶² recommended further investigations of how to prepare students for the peer assessment activities.

The second phase concerns the organization and structure of the formative peer assessment activity, for example, how to give and receive feedback. The current scoping review reveals the complexity of peer collaboration in formative peer assessment: It affects students' emotions concerning both themselves and their relationship with their peers. This coincides with earlier research emphasizing the social factors of peer assessment and the importance for teachers to consider them.⁴ Nevertheless, surprisingly, few studies highlight the collaborative part of peer assessment.^{4 11} One reason might be that formative peer assessment is often presented as a "stand alone" activity and not involved in a collaborative learning environment.^{8 63} We agree with earlier research^{64 65} arguing that peer assessment needs to be affiliated with practices of collaborative learning. Similar implications are presented by Tornwall,¹² who concluded the importance of integrating peer collaboration as a natural approach throughout education to support student development.

47 341

342 CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Some have argued that the research on peer assessment is deficient in referring to exactly what peer assessment aims to achieve.⁶⁶ We conclude that within healthcare education the aim of formative peer assessment is to prepare students for the collaborative aspects crucial within the healthcare professions. However, healthcare education must consider preparing and introducing students to collaborative learning; therefore, it must develop well-designed learning activities aligned with the learning outcomes. Based on this scoping review,

Page 13 of 31

BMJ Open

formative peer assessment needs to be implemented in a collaborative learning environment
throughout the education to be effective. However, since peer collaboration seems to affect
students' and teachers' experiences of formative peer assessment, empirical investigations
exploring the collaboration between students are of utmost importance.

11 353 **LIMITATIONS**

Previous methodological concerns and discussions have been related to the systematic approach of handling grey literature.^{67 68} We argue that the grey literature contributes to a wider understanding of the research area. When we were conducting a critical appraisal of included studies, the grey literature was excluded due to lack of methodological rigor. Therefore, we recommend considering this time-consuming phase of the methodology in scoping reviews. We further acknowledge that the last search was conducted in May 2019 and studies may have been included if an additional search had been provided after this date and in other databases than the ones presented. Further, the current scoping review has not fully elucidated the perspective of teachers and faculty. Few of the included studies highlight the teachers' perspective, so further research is required.

Authors' contribution: MS led the design, search strategy, and conceptualization of this work and drafted the manuscript. EM, MB, and EC were involved in the conceptualization of the review design, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and critical appraisal and provided feedback on the methodology and the manuscript. All authors give their approval to the publishing of this scoping review manuscript.

- 40
 41
 42
 43
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 49
 40
 40
 41
 42
 43
 43
 44
 44
 45
 45
 46
 47
 48
 48
 49
 49
 40
 40
 40
 40
 41
 42
 43
 43
 44
 44
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 48
 49
 49
 40
 40
 41
 41
 41
 41
 41
 42
 43
 44
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 48
 49
 49
 40
 41
 41
 41
 42
 43
 44
 44
 44
 44
 45
 46
 47
 47
 48
 49
 49
 49
 49
 40
 41
 41
 41
 41
 42
 43
 44
 44
 44
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 49
 40
 41
 41
 41
 42
 43
 44
 44
 44
 44
 44
 44
 44
 44
 44
 44
 44
 44
 44
 44
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 44
 44
 4
- ⁴⁴₄₅ 371 **Competing interests:** None declared.

46
 47 372 Patient and public involvement: As this is a scoping review no primary research has been
 48
 49 373 conducted and thus not involve patients or the public.

Acknowledgement: Special thanks to the members in the expert group for their valuable
 374 contribution in the consultation.

- Additional data: No additional data available.

- Figure 1. PRISMA Flowchart
- 60 378 **REFERENCES**

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

 aso education 1999;24(4):413-26. at Topping KJ, Ehly SW. Peer assisted learning: A framework for consultation. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation 2001;12(2):113-32. asy Agotskii LS. Thought and language: MIT press 2012. asy A. Topping KJ, Peer Assessment. 2009;20:27. doi: 10.1080/00405840802577569 Dannefer EF, Henson LC, Bierer SB, et al. Peer assessment of professional competence. Medical <i>Education</i> 2005;39(7):713-22. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02193.x Casey D, Burke E, Houghton C, et al. Use of peer assessment as a student engagement strategy in nurse education. Nursing & health sciences 2011;13(4):514-20. Orsmond' P, Merry S, Callaghan A. Implementation of a formative assessment model incorporating peer and self-assessment. Innovations in Education and Teaching Internationa 2004;41(3):273-90. Ashenafi MM. Peer-assessment in higher education – twenty-first century practices, challenges and the way forward. Assessment and Evoluation in Higher Education 2017;42(2):226-51. do 10.1080/02602938.2015.1100711 Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. Journal of Interprofessiona care 2015;29(1):20-25. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. Journal of medical imaging and radiation sciences 2017;48(2):207-16. Stnoberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. BMC nursing 2015;14(1):48. Stool DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in higher education 2006;31(2):199-218. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback pra
 2. Topping KJ, Ehly SW. Peer assisted learning: A framework for consultation. <i>Journal of Educational</i> <i>and Psychological Consultation</i> 2001;12(2):113-32. 3. Vygotskii LS. Thought and language: MIT press 2012. 4. Topping KJ. Peer Assessment. 2009:20-27. doi: 10.1080/00405840802577569 385 S. Dannefer EF, Henson LC, Bierer SB, et al. Peer assessment of professional competence. <i>Medical</i> <i>Education</i> 2005;39(7):713-22. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02193.x 4. Casey D, Burke E, Houghton C, et al. Use of peer assessment as a student engagement strategy in nurse education. <i>Nursing & health sciences</i> 2011;13(4):514-20. 7. Orsmond* P, Merry S, Callaghan A. Implementation of a formative assessment model incorporating peer and self-assessment. <i>Innovations in Education and Teaching Internationa</i> 2004;41(3):273-90. 8. Ashenafi MM. Peer-assessment in higher education – twenty-first century practices, challenges and the way forward. <i>Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2017;42(2):226-51. do 10.1080/26502938.2015.1100711 9. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. <i>Journal of Interprofessiona</i> <i>aciences</i> 2017;48(2):20-25. 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. <i>Journal of medical imaging and radiation</i> <i>sciences</i> 2017;48(2):20-74. 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. <i>BMC nursing</i> 2015;14(1):48. 20. Tornwall J. Peer assessment tractices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. <i>Studies in higher education</i> 2006;31(2):199-218. 406
 and Psychological Consultation 2001;12(2):113-32. 383 3. Vygotskii LS. Thought and language: MIT press 2012. 4. Topping KJ. Peer Assessment. 2009;20-27. doi: 10.1080/00405840802577569 5. Dannefer EF, Henson LC, Bierer SB, et al. Peer assessment of professional competence. Medical Education 2005;39(7):713-22. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02193.x 6. Casey D, Burke E, Houghton C, et al. Use of peer assessment as a student engagement strategy in nurse education. Nursing & health sciences 2011;13(4):514-20. 7. Orsmond* P, Merry S, Callaghan A. Implementation of a formative assessment model incorporating peer and self-assessment. Innovations in Education and Teaching Internationa 2004;41(3):273-90. 8. Ashenafi MM. Peer-assessment in higher education – twenty-first century practices, challenges and the way forward. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 2017;42(2):226-51. do 10.1080/02602938.2015.1100711 9. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role bluring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. Journal of Interprofessional care 2015;29(1):20-25. 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. Journal of medical imaging and radiation sciences 2017;48(2):207-16. 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. BMC nursing 2015;14(1):48. 403 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in higher education. 2006;31(2):199-218. 404 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in higher education: 2006;31(2):199-218. 405 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment prac
 383 3. Vygotskii LS. Thought and language: MIT press 2012. 384 4. Topping KJ. Peer Assessment. 2009:20-27. doi: 10.1080/0405840802577569 385 5. Dannefer EF, Henson LC, Bierer SB, et al. Peer assessment of professional competence. Medical Education 2005;39(7):713-22. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02193.x 387 6. Casey D, Burke E, Houghton C, et al. Use of peer assessment as a student engagement strategy in nurse education. Nursing & health sciences 2011;13(4):514-20. 389 7. Orsmond* P, Merry S, Callaghan A. Implementation of a formative assessment model incorporating peer and self-assessment. Innovations in Education and Teaching Internationa 2004;41(3):273-90. 392 8. Ashenafi MM. Peer-assessment in higher education – twenty-first century practices, challenges and the way forward. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 2017;42(2):226-51. do 10.1080/02602938.2015.1100711 395 9. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. Journal of Interprofessiona care 2015;29(1):20-25. 398 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. Journal of medical imaging and radiation sciences 2017;48(2):207-16. 397 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. <i>BMC nursing</i> 2015;14(1):48. 406 13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. Advances in physiology education 2006;31(2):139-313. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 308 14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment tan be fun as well as education: principles, polic & practice 1998;5(1):7-74. 310 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. Assessment i medical education: a systemati creview. M
 4. Topping KJ. Peer Assessment. 2009:20-27. doi: 10.1080/00405840802577569 385 5. Dannefer EF, Henson LZ, Bierer SB, et al. Peer assessment of professional competence. <i>Medical Education</i> 2005;39(7):713-22. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02193.x 6. Casey D, Burke E, Houghton C, et al. Use of peer assessment as a student engagement strategy in nurse education. <i>Nursing & health sciences</i> 2011;13(4):514-20. 7. Orsmond⁺ P, Merry S, Callaghan A. Implementation of a formative assessment model incorporating peer and self-assessment. <i>Innovations in Education and Teaching Internationa</i> 2004;41(3):273-90. 8. Ashendi IMM. Peer-assessment in higher education – twenty-first century practices, challenges and the way forward. <i>Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2017;42(2):226-51. do 10.1080/02602938.2015.1100711 9. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role blurring in interprofessional health care teams: a realist synthesis. <i>Journal of Interprofessiona care</i> 2015;29(1):20-25. 9. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. <i>Journal of medical imaging and radiation sciences</i> 2017;48(2):207-16. 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. <i>Journal of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. BMC nursing</i> 2015;14(1):48. 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. <i>Advances in physiology education</i> 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.0004.2005 14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. <i>Studies in higher education: principles, polici & practice</i> 1998;5(1):7-74. 15. Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment and cl
 S. Dannefer EF, Henson LC, Bierer SB, et al. Peer assessment of professional competence. Medical Education 2005;39(7):713-22. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02193.x C. Casey D, Burke E, Houghton C, et al. Use of peer assessment as a student engagement strategy in nurse education. Nursing & health sciences 2011;13(4):514-20. Orsmond⁺ P, Merry S, Callaghan A. Implementation of a formative assessment model incorporating peer and self-assessment. Innovations in Education and Teaching Internationa 2004;41(3):273-90. Ashenafi MM. Peer-assessment in higher education – twenty-first century practices, challenges and the way forward. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 2017;42(2):226-51. do 10.1080/02602938.2015.1100711 Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. Journal of Interprofessional care 2015;29(1):20-25. Norley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. Journal of medical imaging and radiation sciences 2017;48(2):207-16. Stenser M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. BMC nursing 2015;14(1):48. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in higher education 2006;31(2):199-218. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment and self-assellate education. physiology education 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: principles, polic & practice 1998;6(3):249-76. Sodler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. Asse
11386Education 2005;39(7):713-22. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02193.x123876. Casey D, Burke E, Houghton C, et al. Use of peer assessment as a student engagement strategy in13388nurse education. Nursing & health sciences 2011;13(4):514-20.143907. Orsmond* P, Merry S, Callaghan A. Implementation of a formative assessment model15391incorporating peer and self-assessment. Innovations in Education and Teaching Internationa173928. Ashenafi MM. Peer-assessment in higher education – twenty-first century practices, challenges18393and the way forward. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 2017;42(2):226-51. do193949. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role29blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. Journal of Interprofessional20care 2015;29(1):20-25.2010. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. Journal of medical imaging and radiation21sciences 2017;48(2):207-16.2110. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in unse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75.244022015;14(1):48.2013. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and Erregulated learning: A model and24seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in higher education 2006;31(2):199-218.254042613. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and hearning. Assessment in Education: principles, polici2682740728
 387 6. Casey D, Burke E, Houghton C, et al. Use of peer assessment as a student engagement strategy in nurse education. <i>Nursing & health sciences</i> 2011;13(4):514-20. 7. Orsmond* P, Merry S, Callaghan A. Implementation of a formative assessment model incorporating peer and self-assessment. <i>Innovations in Education and Teaching Internationa</i> 2004;41(3):273-90. 8. Ashenafi MM. Peer-assessment in higher education – twenty-first century practices, challenges and the way forward. <i>Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2017;42(2):226-51. do 10.1080/02602938.2015.1100711 9. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. <i>Journal of Interprofessiona</i> <i>care</i> 2015;29(1):20-25. 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. <i>Journal of medical imaging and radiation</i> <i>sciences</i> 2017;48(2):207-16. 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. <i>BMC nursing</i> 2015;14(1):48. 21. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 32. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practice sin nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 33. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. <i>Studies in higher education</i> 2006;31(2):199-218. 34. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. <i>Advances in</i> <i>physiology education</i> 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 35. Black P, Willam D. Assessment and classroom learning. <i>Assessment in Education: principles, polici & practice</i> 1998;5(1):7-74. 34. 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in comple
13 nurse education. Nursing & health sciences 2011;13(4):514-20. 14 389 7. Orsmond* P, Merry S, Callaghan A. Implementation of a formative assessment model incorporating peer and self-assessment. Innovations in Education and Teaching Internationa 2004;41(3):273-90. 18 392 8. Ashenafi MM. Peer-assessment in higher education – twenty-first century practices, challenges and the way forward. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 2017;42(2):226-51. do 10.1080/02602938.2015.1100711 11 395 9. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. Journal of Interprofessiona care 2015;29(1):20-25. 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. Journal of medical imaging and radiation sciences 2017;48(2):207-16. 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. BMC nursing 2015;14(1):48. 10 Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in urse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 11. Steopod feedback practice. Studies in higher education 2006;31(2):199-218. 14 Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in higher education: Inciples, polic; 8 practice 1998;5(1):7-74. 14 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. Assessment & <i></i>
 389 7. Orsmond* P, Merry S, Callaghan A. Implementation of a formative assessment model incorporating peer and self-assessment. <i>Innovations in Education and Teaching Internationa</i> 2004;41(3):273-90. 392 8. Ashenafi MM. Peer-assessment in higher education – twenty-first century practices, challenges and the way forward. <i>Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2017;42(2):226-51. do 10.1080/02602938.2015.1100711 395 9. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. <i>Journal of Interprofessiona</i> <i>care</i> 2015;29(1):20-25. 398 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. <i>Journal of medical imaging and radiation</i> <i>sciences</i> 2017;48(2):207-16. 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. <i>BMC nursing</i> 2015;14(1):48. 403 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. <i>Studies in higher education</i> 2006;31(2):199-218. 404 14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. <i>Advances in</i> <i>physiology education</i> 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 408 411 <i>Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2010;35(5):535-50. 411 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. <i>Assessment &</i> <i>Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2010;35(5):535-50. 412 17. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. <i>Review of educationa</i> <i>Research</i> 1998;6(8):249-76. 413 8. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessme
 incorporating peer and self-assessment. <i>Innovations in Education and Teaching Internationa</i> 2004;41(3):273-90. 392 8. Ashenafi MM. Peer-assessment in higher education – twenty-first century practices, challenges and the way forward. <i>Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2017;42(2):226-51. do 933 99 9. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. <i>Journal of Interprofessional care</i> 2015;29(1):20-25. 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. <i>Journal of medical imaging and radiation sciences</i> 2017;48(2):207-16. 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. <i>BMC nursing</i> 2015;14(1):48. 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. <i>Studies in higher education</i> 2006;31(2):199-218. 14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. <i>Advances in physiology education</i> 2006;31(1):133-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 15. Black P, William D. Assessment and classroom learning. <i>Assessment in Education: principles, polici & practice</i> 1998;5(1):7-74. 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. <i>Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2013;3(1):535-50. 17. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. <i>Review of educationa Research</i> 1998;6(8):249-76. 18. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in medical education: a systematic review. <i>Med Teach</i> 2011;3(1):1:572
 2004;41(3):273-90. 8. Ashenafi MM. Peer-assessment in higher education – twenty-first century practices, challenges and the way forward. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 2017;42(2):226-51. do 10.1080/02602938.2015.1100711 9. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. Journal of Interprofessiona care 2015;29(1):20-25. 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. Journal of medical imaging and radiation sciences 2017;48(2):207-16. 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. BMC nursing 2015;14(1):48. 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in higher education 2006;31(2):199-218. 14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. Advances in physiology education 2006;30(1):3i-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 15. Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment backs com learning. Assessment in Education: principles, polici & practice 1998;5(1):7-74. 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 2010;35(5):535-50. 17. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. Review of educationa Research 1998;68(3):249-76. 18. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in medical education: a systematic review. Med Teach 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 19. Lerchen
 392 8. Ashenafi MM. Peer-assessment in higher education – twenty-first century practices, challenges and the way forward. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 2017;42(2):226-51. do 10.1080/02602938.2015.1100711 9. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. Journal of Interprofessional care 2015;29(1):20-25. 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. Journal of medical imaging and radiation sciences 2017;48(2):207-16. 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. BMC nursing 2015;14(1):48. 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in higher education 2006;31(2):199-218. 14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. Advances in physiology education 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 15. Black P, Willam D. Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: principles, polici & practice 1998;5(1):7-74. 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 2010;35(5):535-50. 17. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. Review of educationa Research 1998;68(3):249-76. 18. Speyer R, Pilz W, van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in medical education: a systematic review. Med Teach 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 19. Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. T
 and the way forward. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 2017;42(2):226-51. do 10.1080/02602938.2015.1100711 9. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. Journal of Interprofessional are 2015;29(1):20-25. 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. Journal of medical imaging and radiation sciences 2017;48(2):207-16. 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. BMC nursing 2015;14(1):48. 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in higher education 2006;31(2):199-218. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment and be fun as well as educational. Advances in physiology education 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 Black P, Willam D. Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: principles, polici & practice 1998;5(1):7-74. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. Assessment & Sapeyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in medical education: a systematic review. Med Teach 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. BMC medical education 2019;
 394 10.1080/02602938.2015.1100711 395 9. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. <i>Journal of Interprofessional</i> <i>care</i> 2015;29(1):20-25. 398 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. <i>Journal of medical imaging and radiation</i> <i>sciences</i> 2017;48(2):207-16. 400 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. <i>BMC nursing</i> 2015;14(1):48. 403 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018;266-75. 404 13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. <i>Studies in higher education</i> 2006;31(2):199-218. 406 407 <i>physiology education</i> 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 408 15. Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment and classroom learning. <i>Assessment in Education: principles, policy</i> <i>& practice</i> 1998;5(1):7-74. 409 <i>& practice</i> 1998;5(1):7-74. 410 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. <i>Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2010;35(5):535-50. 411 T. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. <i>Review of educationa</i> <i>Research</i> 1998;68(3):249-76. 413 Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in medical education: a systematic review. <i>Med Teach</i> 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 417 19. Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. <i>BMC medical education</i> 2019;19(1):321.
 395 9. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. <i>Journal of Interprofessional</i> 397 398 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. <i>Journal of medical imaging and radiation</i> 399 398 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. <i>Journal of medical imaging and radiation</i> 399 390 391 392 393 393 394 394 395 396 396 397 398 397 398 399 399 399 391 391 392 393 393 393 394 394 394 395 394 395 396 397 397 398 398 398 399 391 391 391 391 391 392 393 393 393 394 394 394 394 395 394 395 396 396 396 396 396 396 396 396 397 398 398 398 399 399 390 390 390 390 391 391 391 392 393 393 393 394 394
 396 blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. Journal of Interprofessional care 2015;29(1):20-25. 398 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. Journal of medical imaging and radiation sciences 2017;48(2):207-16. 400 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. BMC nursing 2015;14(1):48. 403 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 404 13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in higher education 2006;31(2):199-218. 406 407 physiology education 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 408 14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. Advances in physiology education 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 409 409 400 4000 40005 4000 400000 40000000000
 397 care 2015;29(1):20-25. 398 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. Journal of medical imaging and radiation 399 sciences 2017;48(2):207-16. 400 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. <i>BMC nursing</i> 2015;14(1):48. 403 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018;266-75. 404 31. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. <i>Studies in higher education</i> 2006;31(2):199-218. 406 14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. <i>Advances in physiology education</i> 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 408 15. Black P, Willam D. Assessment and classroom learning. <i>Assessment in Education: principles, polic</i> <i>& practice</i> 1998;5(1):7-74. 410 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. <i>Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2010;35(5):535-50. 411 <i>Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2010;35(5):535-50. 412 17. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. <i>Review of educationa</i> <i>Research</i> 1998;68(3):249-76. 414 18. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in medical education: a systematic review. <i>Med Teach</i> 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 417 19. Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. <i>BMC medical education</i> 2019;19(1):321. 420 20. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination A scoping review. <i>Medical Teacher</i> 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142
 Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. <i>Journal of medical imaging and radiation</i> <i>sciences</i> 2017;48(2):207-16. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. <i>BMC nursing</i> 2015;14(1):48. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. <i>Studies in higher education</i> 2006;31(2):199-218. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. <i>Advances in</i> <i>physiology education</i> 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 Black P, Willam D. Assessment and classroom learning. <i>Assessment in Education: principles, polic</i>. <i>& practice</i> 1998;5(1):7-74. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. <i>Assessment &</i> <i>Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2010;35(5):535-50. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. <i>Review of educationa</i>. <i>Research</i> 1998;68(3):249-76. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in medical education: a systematic review. <i>Med Teach</i> 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. <i>BMC medical education</i> 2019;19(1):321. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination A scoping review. <i>Medical Teacher</i> 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.130937
 sciences 2017;48(2):207-16. 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. <i>BMC nursing</i> 2015;14(1):48. 403 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. <i>Studies in higher education</i> 2006;31(2):199-218. 406 14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. <i>Advances in</i> <i>physiology education</i> 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 15. Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment and classroom learning. <i>Assessment in Education: principles, polic</i>. <i>& practice</i> 1998;5(1):7-74. 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. <i>Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2010;35(5):535-50. 17. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. <i>Review of educationa</i>. <i>Research</i> 1998;68(3):249-76. 18. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in medical education: a systematic review. <i>Med Teach</i> 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 19. Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. <i>BMC medical education</i> 2019;19(1):321. 20. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination A scoping review. <i>Medical Teacher</i> 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.130937
 400 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. <i>BMC nursing</i> 2015;14(1):48. 403 403 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 404 405 406 407 408 408 408 409 409 409 409 401 400 401 401 402 402 403 403 404 404 405 405 406 407 408 408 408 409 409 409 409 409 409 400 400 400 400 400 400 400 401 401 402 402 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 408 408 408 408 409 409 409 400 400 400 400 400 400 400 401 401 402 402 402 402 403 404 405 406 407 408 408 408 408 408 408 409 409 400 400 400 400 401 400 401 404 405 406 407 408 408 408 408 408 408 408 409 409 409 400 400 400 401 400 401<!--</td-->
 401 model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. <i>BMC nursing</i> 402 2015;14(1):48. 403 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 404 13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and 405 seven principles of good feedback practice. <i>Studies in higher education</i> 2006;31(2):199-218. 406 14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. <i>Advances in</i> 407 <i>physiology education</i> 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 408 15. Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment and classroom learning. <i>Assessment in Education: principles, polic</i>, 409 & <i>practice</i> 1998;5(1):7-74. 410 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. <i>Assessment &</i> 411 <i>Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2010;35(5):535-50. 412 17. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. <i>Review of educationa</i> 413 <i>Research</i> 1998;68(3):249-76. 414 18. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in 415 medical education: a systematic review. <i>Med Teach</i> 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 416 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 417 19. Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in 418 undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. <i>BMC medical education</i> 419 2019;19(1):321. 420 20. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination 421 Ascoping review. <i>Medical Teacher</i> 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.130937
 402 2015;14(1):48. 403 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 404 13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and 405 seven principles of good feedback practice. <i>Studies in higher education</i> 2006;31(2):199-218. 406 14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. <i>Advances in</i> 407 <i>physiology education</i> 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 408 15. Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment and classroom learning. <i>Assessment in Education: principles, policy</i> 409 <i>& practice</i> 1998;5(1):7-74. 410 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. <i>Assessment &</i> 411 <i>Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2010;35(5):535-50. 412 17. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. <i>Review of educationa</i> 413 <i>Research</i> 1998;68(3):249-76. 414 18. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in 415 medical education: a systematic review. <i>Med Teach</i> 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 416 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 417 19. Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in 419 undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. <i>BMC medical education</i> 419 2019;19(1):321. 420 20. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination 421 Ascoping review. <i>Medical Teacher</i> 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.130937
 403 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 404 13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and 405 seven principles of good feedback practice. <i>Studies in higher education</i> 2006;31(2):199-218. 406 14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. <i>Advances in</i> 407 <i>physiology education</i> 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 408 15. Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment and classroom learning. <i>Assessment in Education: principles, polic</i> 409 <i>& practice</i> 1998;5(1):7-74. 410 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. <i>Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2010;35(5):535-50. 411 <i>Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2010;35(5):535-50. 412 17. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. <i>Review of educationa</i> 413 <i>Research</i> 1998;68(3):249-76. 414 18. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in 415 medical education: a systematic review. <i>Med Teach</i> 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 416 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 417 19. Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in 418 undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. <i>BMC medical education</i> 419 2019;19(1):321. 420 20. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination 421 A scoping review. <i>Medical Teacher</i> 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.130937
 404 13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. <i>Studies in higher education</i> 2006;31(2):199-218. 405 406 407 408 407 409 408 408 409 409 409 409 409 400 400 400 400 400 401 401 402 402 403 404 404 405 405 406 407 409 408 410 410 410 411 411 411 412 412 412 413 414 414 415 414 415 415 416 416 416 417 418 418 418 419 419 410 419 410 414 415 415 416 416 417 418 419 419 419 410 418 410 414 415 415 416 417 418 418 419 419 410 419 410 411 411 412 414 414 415 415 416 417 418 418 419 419 410 410 411 411 412 412 414 413 414 415 414 415 415 416 417 418 418 418 419 419 411 414 414 415 414 415 415 415 416 417 418 418 418 419 419 411 418 419 411 411 411 412 412 413
 405 seven principles of good feedback practice. <i>Studies in higher education</i> 2006;31(2):199-218. 406 14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. <i>Advances in</i> <i>physiology education</i> 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 408 15. Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment and classroom learning. <i>Assessment in Education: principles, polic</i>. 409 & practice 1998;5(1):7-74. 410 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. <i>Assessment &</i> <i>Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2010;35(5):535-50. 411 <i>Evaluation in Higher Education</i> 2010;35(5):535-50. 412 17. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. <i>Review of educationa</i> <i>Research</i> 1998;68(3):249-76. 413 <i>Research</i> 1998;68(3):249-76. 414 18. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in medical education: a systematic review. <i>Med Teach</i> 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 416 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 417 19. Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. <i>BMC medical education</i> 2019;19(1):321. 420 20. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination A scoping review. <i>Medical Teacher</i> 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.130937
 406 14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. Advances in physiology education 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 408 407 409 409 409 409 410 415. Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: principles, polic & practice 1998;5(1):7-74. 410 411 412 412 413 413 414 413 414 413 415 414 415 415 416. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 2010;35(5):535-50. 414 413 413 414 414 414 415 414 415 415 416 417 418 417 418 418 419 420 420 420 420 420 420 420 420 421 421 421 422 420 420 420 421 431 441 4421 4421 443 444 444 444 444 444 444 444 445 445 446 446 447 447 448 448 449 449 440 440 440 440 441 441 441 441 4420 441 4420 441 4420 4420 444 444 444 444 444 444 445 445 446 446 447 447 448 448 448 449 449 440 440 440 441 441 441 441 4420 4420 441 441 4420
 407 physiology education 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 408 15. Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: principles, polic & practice 1998;5(1):7-74. 410 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 2010;35(5):535-50. 412 17. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. Review of educationa Research 1998;68(3):249-76. 414 18. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in medical education: a systematic review. Med Teach 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 417 19. Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. BMC medical education 2019;19(1):321. 420 20. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination A scoping review. Medical Teacher 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.130937
 408 408 409 409 409 409 409 409 409 410 410 410 411 411 412 412 412 413 413 414 413 415 414 415 416 416 417 418 419 419 419 419 419 419 410 410 411 412 411 413 414 415 415 416 416 416 417 418 419 419 419 419 419 410 420 420 431 441 441 442 443 444 444 444 445 444 445 446 447 447 447 448 448 449 449 449 440 449 440 440 441 441 441 441 442 441 442 442 444 444 445 446 447 447 447 448 448 448 449 449 440 440 441 441 441 441 442 441 442 442 442 444 444 445 445 446 447 447 448 448 448 449 449 449 440 441 441 441 441 442 444 444 444 444 444 444 444 444 444
 409 & practice 1998;5(1):7-74. a8 410 a16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 2010;35(5):535-50. 412 412 412 17. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. Review of educationa Research 1998;68(3):249-76. 414 413 Research 1998;68(3):249-76. 414 415 medical education: a systematic review. Med Teach 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 417 418 undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. BMC medical education 2019;19(1):321. 420 20. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination A scoping review. Medical Teacher 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.130937
 410 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. Assessment & 411 Evaluation in Higher Education 2010;35(5):535-50. 412 413 413 413 414 413 414 415 414 415 415 416 416 416 417 416 417 417 418 418 419 419 419 419 419 419 420 420 431 441 441 441 442 441 443 444 444 444 444 444 444 444 445 444 445 444 445 446 446 446 447 447 448 448 449 449 449 440 440 440 441 442 441 442 442 442 444
 411 Evaluation in Higher Education 2010;35(5):535-50. 412 412 17. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. Review of educationa 41 413 Research 1998;68(3):249-76. 414 18. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in 415 medical education: a systematic review. Med Teach 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 416 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 417 19. Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in 418 undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. BMC medical education 419 2019;19(1):321. 420 20. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination 421 A scoping review. Medical Teacher 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.130937
 40 412 417. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. <i>Review of educationa</i> 41 413 <i>Research</i> 1998;68(3):249-76. 414 413 <i>Research</i> 1998;68(3):249-76. 414 415 <i>Research</i> 1998;68(3):249-76. 415 416 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Validity of student peer assessment in 415 416 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 417 418 undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. <i>BMC medical education</i> 419 2019;19(1):321. 420 420 20. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination 421 A scoping review. <i>Medical Teacher</i> 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.130937
 41 413 Research 1998;68(3):249-76. 42 414 18. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in 43 415 medical education: a systematic review. Med Teach 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 416 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 46 417 19. Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in 47 418 undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. BMC medical education 48 419 2019;19(1):321. 49 420 20. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination 50 421 A scoping review. Medical Teacher 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.130937
 414 414 415 415 416 417 418. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in 415 416 416 417 417 418. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in 415 416 417 417 418. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in 418 419 419 420 420 420 420 421 42
 43 415 44 415 416 416 417 418 418 419 419 420 420 420 431 441 <l< td=""></l<>
 44 416 417 418 419 420 420 420 421 421 421 421 421 422 421 432 443 444 <
 45 46 417 47 418 419 419 420 420 420 421 421 421 421 421 422 421 431 442 443 444 <li< td=""></li<>
 47 418 undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. <i>BMC medical education</i> 48 419 2019;19(1):321. 49 420 20. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination 50 421 A scoping review. <i>Medical Teacher</i> 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.130937
 48 419 2019;19(1):321. 49 420 20. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination 50 421 A scoping review. <i>Medical Teacher</i> 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.130937
 49 420 20. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination 50 421 A scoping review. <i>Medical Teacher</i> 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.130937
⁵⁰ 421 A scoping review. <i>Medical Teacher</i> 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.130937
⁵¹ 422 21. Arksev H. O'Mallev L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. <i>International</i>
⁵² 423 Journal of Social Research Methodology 2005:8(1):19-32. doi:
⁵³ 424 10.1080/1364557032000119616
54
56 426 Science 2010:5(1):69. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-5-69
57 427 23. Stenberg M. Mangrio E. Bengtsson M. et al. Formative peer assessment in healthcare education
58 A28 programmes: protocol for a scoping roviow, <i>DAI</i> open 2019.0/11/2002EDEE oEF doi:
59 429 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-025055

2		
3	430	24. Peters M, Godfrey C, McInerney P, et al. Methodology for JBI scoping reviews. The Joanna Briggs
4	431	Institute Reviewers manual 2015: The Joanna Briggs Institute 2015:3-24.
5	432	25. Morris M, Boruff JT, Gore GC. Scoping reviews: establishing the role of the librarian. <i>Journal of the</i>
6	433	Medical Library Association: JMLA 2016;104(4):346.
/	434	26. Moher D. Liberati A. Tetzlaff J. et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-
ð 0	435	analyses: the PRISMA statement. Annals of internal medicine 2009:151(4):264-69.
9 10	436	27. Programme CAS. Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. CASP checklist 2018 [Available from:
11	437	https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/ accessed 5 august 2018
12	438	28 Daudt HM, van Mossel C. Scott SI. Enhancing the sconing study methodology: a large inter-
13	439	professional team's experience with Arksev and O'Malley's framework <i>BMC medical</i>
14	440	research methodology 2013:13(1):48
15	440 441	29 Hong O Pluve P Fabregues S et al. Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018: User
16	112 112	guide Department of Family Medicine McGuill Univertity 2018
17	442	20 Institute IB. Critical Appraisal Tools. [Available from: http://ioappabriggs.org/research/critical-
18	445	appraisal tools html accessed 5 august 2018
19 20	444	21 Weingerten MA Paul M Leibovici L Assessing ethics of trials in systematic reviews <i>Bmi</i>
20	445	2004.229(7446).1012 14
27	440	2004,526(7440).1015-14.
23	447	52. Ouzzahl M, Hammady H, Fedolowicz Z, et al. Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic
24	440	22. Provin V. Clarke V. Heing thematic applying in psychology. Qualitative receased in psychology
25	449	55. Braun V, Clarke V. Osing mematic analysis in psychology. Quantative research in psychology
26	450	2000,5(2).77-101.
27	451	34. Maguire M, Delahull B. Doing a thematic analysis: A practical, step-by-step guide for learning
28	452	and teaching scholars. Alshe-J. The All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher
29	453	Education 2017;9(3)
30 31	454	35. Cushing A, Abbott S, Lothian D, et al. Peer reedback as an aid to learning - what do we want?
32	455	Feedback. When do we want it? Now! <i>Wealcal Teacher</i> 2011;33(2) doi:
33	450	10.3109/0142159X.2011.542522
34	457	36. Iqbal IVI, Velan GIVI, O Sullivan AJ, et al. Differential impact of student benaviours on group
35	458	interaction and collaborative learning: medical students' and tutors' perspectives. Bivic
36	459	medical education 2016;16(1):217-17. doi: 10.1186/\$12909-016-0730-1
37	460	37. Notziger AC, Naumburg EH, Davis BJ, et al. Impact of peer assessment on the professional
38	461	development of medical students: a qualitative study. Academic medicine : journal of the
39 40	462	Association of American Medical Colleges 2010;85(1):140-47. doi:
40 41	463	
42	464	38. Emke AR, Cheng S, Chen L, et al. A Novel Approach to Assessing Professionalism in Precinical
43	465	Medical Students Using Multisource Feedback Inrough Paired Self- and Peer Evaluations.
44	466	Teaching and Learning in Medicine 2017;29(4):402-10. doi: 10.1080/10401334.2017.1306446
45	467	39. Chou CL, Masters DE, Chang A, et al. Effects of longitudinal small-group learning on delivery and
46	468	receipt of communication skills feedback. <i>Medical Education</i> 2013;47(11):1073-79. doi:
47	469	10.1111/medu.12246
48	470	40. Tai JH-M, Canny BJ, Haines TP, et al. The role of peer-assisted learning in building evaluative
49 50	4/1	judgement: opportunities in clinical medical education. Advances in health sciences
50 51	4/2	education : theory and practice 2016;21(3):659-76. doi: 10.1007/s10459-015-9659-0
52	4/3	41. Cho Y, Je S, Yoon YS, et al. The effect of peer-group size on the delivery of feedback in basic life
53	4/4	support refresher training: A cluster randomized controlled trial. BMC Medical Education
54	475	2016;16(1):1-8. doi: 10.1186/s12909-016-0682-5
55	476	42. Moineau G, Power B, Pion A-MJ, et al. Comparison of student examiner to faculty examiner
56	477	scoring and feedback in an OSCE. <i>Medical education</i> 2011;45(2):183-91. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
57	478	2923.2010.03800.x
58	479	43. Satterthwaite JD, Grey NJA. Peer-group assessment of pre-clinical operative skills in restorative
59 60	480	dentistry and comparison with experienced assessors. European Journal of Dental Education
00	481	2008;12(2):99-102. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0579.2008.00509.x

3	482	44. Vaughn CJ, Kim E, O'Sullivan P, et al. Peer video review and feedback improve performance in
4	483	basic surgical skills. American Journal of Surgery 2016;211(2):355-60. doi:
5	484	10.1016/i.amisurg.2015.08.034
6	485	45. Tricio J. Woolford M. Escudier M. Analysis of dental students' written peer feedback from a
/	486	prospective peer assessment protocol. <i>Furgnean Journal of Dental Education</i> 2016:20(4):241-
8	487	47
9 10	182	A6 Rees C Sheard C McPherson A Communication skills assessment: the percentions of medical
10	400	40. Nees C, Sheard C, McFherson A. Communication skins assessment. the perceptions of medical students at the University of Nottingham Medical Education 2002;26(0):868-78
12	409	47. Spandorfor I. Duklus T. Poso V. et al. Door assessment among first year modical students in
13	490	47. Spandoner J, Fukius T, Kose V, et al. Feer assessment among hist year medical students in
14	491	Analomy. Analomy. Analomy of Sciences Education 2014,7(2):144-32. doi: 10.1002/ase.1334
15	492	46. Martin D, Friesen E, De Pau A. Three fieldus are better than one. a mixed methods study
16	495	today 2014-24/6)-071 77 doi: 10.1016/i podt 2014.01.004
17	494	10000 2014;54(6):971-77. doi: 10.1016/J.nedt.2014.01.004
18	495	49. Mul Lim S, Rodger S. The use of Interactive formative assessments with first-year occupational
19	496	therapy students. International Journal of Therapy and Renabilitation 2010;17(11):576-86.
20	497	50. Elshami W, Abdalla ME. Diagnostic radiography students' perceptions of formative peer
21	498	assessment within a radiographic technique module. Radiography (London, England : 1995)
22	499	2017;23(1):9-13. doi: 10.1016/j.radi.2016.06.001
23	500	51. Koh LC. Academic staff perspectives of formative assessment in nurse education. <i>Nurse education</i>
25	501	<i>in practice</i> 2010;10(4):205-09. doi: 10.1016/j.nepr.2009.08.007
26	502	52. Arnold L, Shue CK, Kritt B, et al. Medical students' views on peer assessment of professionalism.
27	503	Journal of General Internal Medicine 2005;20(9):819-24. doi: 10.1111/j.1525-
28	504	1497.2005.0162.x
29	505	53. Carlson E, Stenberg M, Chan B, et al. Nursing as universal and recognisable: Nursing students'
30	506	perceptions of learning outcomes from intercultural peer learning webinars: A qualitative
31	507	study. Nurse education today 2017;57:54-59.
32	508	54. Homberg A, Hundertmark J, Krause J, et al. Promoting medical competencies through a didactic
33 24	509	tutor qualification programme-a qualitative study based on the CanMEDS Physician
24 25	510	Competency Framework. BMC Medical Education 2019;19(1):1-8.
36	511	55. Schwill S, Fahrbach-Veeser J, Moeltner A, et al. Peers as OSCE assessors for junior medical
37	512	students-a review of routine use: a mixed methods study. BMC medical education
38	513	2020;20(1):1-12.
39	514	56. Vickerman P. Student perspectives on formative peer assessment : an attempt to deepen
40	515	learning ? 2009;34(2):221-30. doi: 10.1080/02602930801955986
41	516	57. Sluijsmans D, Prins F. A conceptual framework for integrating peer assessment in teacher
42	517	education. Studies in Educational Evaluation 2006;32(1):6-22.
43	518	58. Boud D, Falchikov N. Developing assessment for informing judgement. <i>Rethinking assessment in</i>
44	519	higher education: Learning for the longer term 2007:181-97.
45 46	520	59. Cassidy S. Developing employability skills : peer assessment in higher education. 2006 doi:
40 47	521	10.1108/00400910610705890
48	522	60. Solheim F. Plathe HS. Fide H. Nursing students' evaluation of a new feedback and reflection tool
49	523	for use in high-fidelity simulation – Formative assessment of clinical skills. A descriptive
50	524	quantitative research design Nurse Education in Practice 2017:27:114-20 doi:
51	525	10 1016/i nenr 2017 08 021
52	525	61 Topping KL Deer assessment Theory into practice 2009:48(1):20-27
53	520	62 Casey D. Burke F. Houghton C. et al. Use of peer assessment as a student engagement strategy in
54	527	burse education. Nursing and Health Sciences 2011:12(4):514-20. doi: 10.1111/j.1442
55	520	10152 Education. Nulsing and Health Sciences 2011,15(4).514-20. 001. 10.1111/j.1442-
56	529	2010.2011.0003/.X 62 Daningzak T. Voung L. Grover M. et al. An analysis of near solf and tyter assessment in archieve
5/ 50	550	based learning tutorials. Mod Tageb 2007;20(5):e122.22. doi: 10.1000/01421500701204222
50 50	531	pased learning tutorials. <i>Web Teach</i> 2007;29(5):e122-32. doi: 10.1080/01421590/01294323
60	532	[published Online First: 2007/09/22]
00		

1 2		
3	533	64. Kollar I, Fischer F. Peer assessment as collaborative learning: A cognitive perspective. Learning
4 5	534	and Instruction 2010;20(4):344-48.
6	535	65. Finn GM, Garner J. Twelve tips for implementing a successful peer assessment. <i>Medical teacher</i>
7	536 537	2011;33(b):443-4b. 66 Jackel B. Pearce I. Badloff A. et al. Assessment and feedback in higher education
8 9	538	67. Gentles SJ, Lokker C, McKibbon KA. Health information technology to facilitate communication
10	539	involving health care providers, caregivers, and pediatric patients: a scoping review. Journal
11 12	540	of medical Internet research 2010;12(2):e22.
12	541 542	68. Pham MT, Rajić A, Greig JD, et al. A scoping review of scoping reviews: advancing the approach and enhancing the consistency. <i>Research synthesis methods</i> 2014;5(4):371-85
14	542	
15 16	543	
17	544	
18 10	544	
19 20	545	
21		
22 23	546	
24	F 4 7	
25 26	547	
20 27	548	
28		
29 30	549	
31		
32	550	
34	551	
35	001	
36 37	552	
38		
39 40	553	
41	55/	
42	554	
45 44	555	
45		
46 47	556	
48	FF7	
49 50	557	
50 51	558	
52		
53 54	559	
55		
56	560	
57 58	561	
59	501	
60		

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

	Population	Concept	Context
	Students assessing students	Intervention, rationale, outcome, context, and students' and teachers' experience of formative peer assessment	Healthcare education program in higher education
564			
65			
66			
567			
568			
500			
569			
570			
571			
72			
73			
73			
73 74			
573 574 575			
73 74 75 76			
573 574 575 576			
573 574 575 576 577			
73 74 75 76 77 78			
573 574 575 576 577 578 579			
73 74 75 76 77 78 79			
73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80			
573 574 575 576 577 578 579 580			

			BMJ Open	отјорен у соруг	
Table 2. Overview of inc	luded studies.			n-2020-045; ight, includ	
Author, year, country, and journal	Aim	Design	Participants	Main findings 6 5 6 9	
Arnold et al., 2005, ⁵² USA Journal of General Internal Medicine	Identify factors that encourage or discourage student participation in peer assessment	Qualitative Grounded theory Focus groups (16) at two medical schools	n=61, medical students in year 1, 3, and 4	The characteristics of the peer sessment system and the environment can encourage or discourage participation frames: (1) Students' struggle with per sessment, (2) Characteristics of a peer sessment system, and (3) Environmental factors	1
Cho et al., 2016, ⁴¹ England <i>BMC Medical</i> <i>Education</i>	Investigate the effect of peer- group size on competency- based skills	Quantitative Cluster RCT	n=115, medical students in year 6	Smaller groups (4.1) show the active and preferred than large groups (8.1). Group size did not impact score and at from the active and min from the active and the active and at	
Chou et al., 2013, ³⁹ USA <i>Medical Education</i>	Examine the role of prior peer-learning relationships between students in their delivery and receipt of feedback on clinical communication skills	Mixed method Case-control Descriptive statistics Survey, video observations	n= 72 medical students in year 3 with prior peer learning relationships n=36 students in control group with no prior peer relationships.	Students with prior peer arming relationships more likely to previde specific corrective feedback than hose without prior relationships. No significant difference between groups regarding how feedback was received.	1
Cushing et al., 2011, ³⁵ United Kingdom <i>Medical Teacher</i>	Investigate the benefits of formative peer feedback in communication skills and develop a training programme in peer feedback	Mixed method Questionnaire (20 items) at two occasions with 6 months in between. Focus groups (5 medical- and 2 nurse students)	n=45 medical students in year 1 n=48 nursing students in year 1	Students valued the learning or portunity of both being examiner and beever. They preferred more in-depth Bedback and feedback from tutors. They expressed anxiety about giving negative geedback to a peer and had mixed viewe on giving feedback (relaxed or pressure) and its use in clinical placements.	1
Elshami & Abdalla, 2017, ⁵⁰ United Arab Emirates <i>Radiography</i>	Assess perception of formative peer assessment	Qualitative Action research Focus groups (3) Content analysis	n=19 (24**) diagnostic radiography students in year 3	Formative peer assessment gives valuable feedback from same lever or more experienced peers. Need for training and detailed rubrics.	1
Emke et al., 2017, ³⁸ USA	Demonstrate that perceptual errors related to professionalism behaviors can be detected early through	Quantitative	n=246 medical students in year 2	Multiple peer assessments and feedback a tool predictor of unprofession behavior.	

			BMJ Open	6/bmjopen-2020 by copyright, i	
Teaching and Learning in Medicine	repeated multisource feedback			ncluding	
Iqbal et al., 2016, ³⁶ Australia <i>BMC Medical</i> <i>Education</i>	Explore students' and tutors' perception of key collaborative behaviors that impact collaborative learning and interaction	Qualitative Focus groups (5) with students Interviews (8) with teachers Thematic analysis	n= 22 medical students in year one and two n= 8 teachers	Being respectful, giving Bonst Lictive feedback, and being engaged and prepared had positive impact on both learning and group interaction. Passiveness unreliability, irresponsibility, and condescending attitudes and a begative impact on learning and ine addition. Similar results from teachers.	high
Koh, 2010, ⁵¹ United Kingdom Nurse Education in Practice	Explore how academic staff experience, understand, and interpret the process of formative assessment and feedback of theoretical assessment	Qualitative Phenomenology Semi-structured interviews (22) Thematic analysis	n=20 academic staff in nurse education	Teachers see themselves as the facilitators and think students prefer the facilitators Students are assumed to have the skill to peer assess and give feetback out are unprepared and need support and introduction early in education. Teachers need professional development themselves.	moderate
Mui Lim & Rodger, 2010. ⁴⁹ Australia International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation	Improve students learning through interactive formative assessment and student generated questions	Mixed methods Cohort study Evaluation questionnaire	n= 115 occupational therapy students in year 1 in 2009 compared with n= 98 students in 2008	Significant improvement in exams result from being part of interadive formative assessment, which is benaticiat for learning and identifying knowled gaps.	moderate
Martin, Friesen, & De Pau, 2014, ⁴⁸ Canada <i>Nurse Education</i> <i>Today</i>	Examine collaborative testing versus traditional test taking with undergraduate nursing students in a nine-station OSCE	Mixed method Cross over design Survey Focus groups	n=70 nursing students	Significantly higher scores in sollaborative testing than in traditional stating. Themes: (1) studying more/studying differently, (2)/ cognitive collectivism (3), "it stuck in my head better" (4), confidence, and (5) practicing how to hare knowledge and negotiate.	moderate
Moineau et al., 2011, ⁴² Canada <i>Medical Education</i>	Compare scores and experiences of formative assessment from faculty and senior students during OSCE- examinations	Quantitative Cross sectional Pre- and post- questionnaire	n=66 medical students in year 2 n=27 year 4 student examiners n=27 teaching doctors	Students (year 4) assessing students (year 2) with checklists in OSCE-examinations equally assessed compared to the culty members. A positive learning expressed from both students and faculty.	moderate
Nofziger et al., 2010, ³⁷	Investigate the impact of peer assessment on future	Qualitative	n=70 medical students in year 2	67% found peer assessment hapful, reassuring, or confirming something they	moderate
			19	EZ-LTA	

 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

			BMJ Open	bmjoper y copyri
				1-2020 ight, ir
USA Academic Medicine	professional development and students' experiences	Questionnaire and narrative comments Frequency count	n=48 in year 4	knew; 65% reported impertant transformations in awareness, stitudes, or behaviors because of per assessment. Change was more likely where feedback was specific and described an area for improvement.
Rees, Sheard, & McPherson, 2002, ⁴⁶ United Kingdom <i>Medical Education</i>	Explore students' perceptions of communication skill assessment	Qualitative Focus groups	n=7 medical students in year 1 n= 7 in year 2 n=10 in year 3 n= 5 in year 4 n=3 in year 5	Year 4 and 5 more positive than younger students. Opportunities than younger communication skills with the set of the level. Learning experience the set of the assessor. No constructive stricts from peers. Difficult to be objective and to give feedback.
Satterthwaite & Grey, 2008, ⁴³ United Kingdom European Journal of Dental Education	Investigate if any differences existed between marks given by a peer group and those given by experienced assessors	Quantitative Cross sectional	n=65 dental students	No significant difference no significant dif
Spandorfer et al., 2014, ⁴⁷ USA <i>Anatomical Science</i> <i>Education</i>	Determine whether peer assessment improves students work habits and interpersonal attributes and whether it is accepted by students, focusing on low performing students	Multi-methods Paired sample t-test Pearson correlation coefficients Survey- content analysis	n=267 medical students in year 1; follow-up in year 2	Significant improvement free bn-line peer feedback between test 1 and 29 Themes: (1) Initiative, (2) Communication, (3) Respect, (4) Preparation, and (5) Focus. Students prefer anonymous feedback from peers.
Tai et al., 2016, ⁴⁰ Australia Advances in Health Science Education	Investigate students' experience of peer-assisted learning.	Mixed methods Ethnographic Survey, observations, and interviews Thematic analysis	n=10 medical students in year 1 (observed) n=191 students in year 3 (survey)	Observing and giving feedback to peers contributed to learning, but students value feedback from teachers for valuation. Students want to preserve social relationships with peers; meretore, feedback is not so constructive Peers provide a supportive learning privinonment.
Tricio, Woolford, & Escudier, 2016, ⁴⁵ United Kingdom European Journal of Dental Education	Analyze written feedback provided as a part of a formative and structured peer assessment protocol.	Multi-methods Descriptive statistic Thematic analysis	n=40 dental students in year 2 in pre-clinical skills laboratory n=68 dental students in year 5 in clinic	Year 2 focuses on practical and clinical knowledge; in contrast, year Scouses comments on communication management, and leadership. Year 2 gives reore positive comments on peer performance than year 5.
			20	EZ-LT,

			BMJ Open	/bmjopen-20; by copyright,	
Vaughn et al., 2016, ⁴⁴ USA <i>The American Journal</i> of Surgery	Evaluate the use, quality, and quantity of peer video feedback and compare peers and faculty feedback.	Quantitative Cross sectional Paired t-test, Mann- Whitney statistic Survey	n=24 medical students***	Significant change in performance across periods in both groups. Paer for data across performed better at final sees ment than faculty feedback group (not significant). Peers gave higher scores than taculty. No significant differences when using a checklist.	s 3 mo pup
*High equals majority of	items in the critical appraisal too	ls.		relate	
**24 students included in	1 the intervention, and 19 attended	I the focus group session.		021. 1 to t	
***12 students received f	faculty feedback, and 12 students	received peer feedback.		Dow ext a	
				ind d	
				aded ool . lata i	
				mini. ni	
				n htt ng, /	
				Al tra	
				unin ^m jop	
				g, an	
				nd sii	
				<u>ni</u> ģ	
				a z	
				n/ on l ar tech	
				n/ on May . ar technol	
				n/ on May 14, 2 ar technologie:	
				n/ on May 14, 2025 ar technologies.	
				n/ on May 14, 2025 at De ar technologies.	
				n/ on May 14, 2025 at Depar ar technologies.	
				n/ on May 14, 2025 at Departmer ar technologies.	
				n/ on May 14, 2025 at Department Gt ar technologies.	
			21	n/ on May 14, 2025 at Department GEZ-Li ar technologies.	

3 4

24

36/bmjopen-2020-045345 on 9 Fe

BMJ Open Table 3. Overview and summery of the context, rationale, and interventions of formative peer assessment presented in the included studies.

Contexts	Rationales	Interventions Ea man
Intra-professional students (17)*	Giving and receiving feeback supports student learning:	Introduction (in workshops):
Combination of medical and nursing	Promotes learning (8)	Preparations in giving and receive gedeedback (3)
students (1)	Enhances critical thinking (1)	Introduction of guidelines or cheeklists to guide the peer assessor (3)
	Promotes understanding of the assessment process (1)	Introduction of the learning active $\nabla \nabla \Sigma$
Conducted in the following:	Develops critical- and interpersonal skills (1)	Preparation in communication
Clinical skill labs (11)	Helps identify knowledge gaps (1)	nd
Theoretical courses (7)	Supports low-performance students (1)	Learning activities focusing fe
Combination of theoretical and		Clinical skills (3)
clinical placement course (1)	It prepares students for knowledge-related professionalism in	Collaborative behavior (2) $\mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{H}$
-	the healthcare profession by helping them identify the	Clinical reasoning (2) Ξ g
	following:	Theoretical knowledge (2)
Within an educational model as	Professional- and un-professional behavior (6)	Communication skills (2) \rightarrow
problem-based learning, peer learning,	Clinical competence (2)	Management skills (1)
or peer assisted learning (7)	Technical skills (2)	
	Communication skills (2)	Feedback types:
	Collaborative behavior (2)	Face-to-face (7)
	Evaluative judgement (1)	Anonymous (5)
		Written (3) or through observations 3)
	It enhances teachers' teaching (1)	Interactive on-line assessment (2)
		Grading of the given feedback $\underline{2}$)
	It provides cost benefits:	
	Students as assessors instead of teachers (2)	Random peers (8)
	Students as creators of the learning activities instead of	Ability to choose peer (1) \mathbf{S}
	teachers (1)	In small groups $< 6(6)$
		In large groups $> 6(3)$ $\overline{0}$
		yie , 2
= appears in how many of the included	18 studies	s. 202
**		ίň
		at
		De
		pa
		ner
		l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l
		ନ ମ
		Ň
	22	5

to peet teriew only



100x122mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Erasmushogeschool Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

	Search block 1: Healthcare education
#	MESH-terms
1	"Students, Medical"[Mesh] OR
2	"Students, Nursing"[Mesh] OR
3	"Students, Dental" [Mesh] OR
4	"Students, Health Occupations"[Mesh] OR
5	"Education, Medical"[Mesh] OR
6	"Education, Nursing"[Mesh] OR
7	"Education, Dental" [Mesh] OR
8	"Midwifery/education"[Mesh] OR
9	"Allied Health Personnel/education"[Mesh]
10	S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4 OR S5 OR S6 OR S7 OR S8
Ħ	Free text terms
11	"medical student*" OR
12	"nurging student*" OP
12	"midwifery student* OR
13	"dental student*" OP
15	"nhysical therapy student*" OR
16	"accupational therapy student "OR
17	"allied health student*" OP
18	"health occupations student*" OR
10	"health care stud*" OR
20	"Health care education" OR
20	"health science education" OR
21	"Medical education" OR
22	"Nursing education" OR
23	"Dental education" OR
25	"allied health education" OR
26	"Health occupation* education*" OR
27	"midwifery education"
28	S11 OR S12 OR S13 OR S14 ORS15 OR S16 OR S17
	OR S18 OR S19 OR S20 OR S21 OR S22 OR S23 OR
	S24 OR S25 OR S26 OR S27
29	S10 OR S28
	·
	Search block 2: Peer assessment

	Search block 2: Peer assessment
#	MESH
31	"Educational Measurement"[Mesh] OR
32	"Peer Group"[Mesh] OR
33	"Peer Review" [Mesh]
34	S31 OR S32 OR S33
#	Free text terms
35	"peer assessment" OR
36	"peer evaluation" OR
37	"peer observation" OR
38	"peer feedback" OR
39	"peer review" OR
40	"peer assess*" OR
41	"*peer assess" OR
42	"peer examiner" OR
43	"peer grad*" OR
44	"peer group" OR
45	"Student performance appraisal" OR
46	"educational measurement"
47	S35 OR S36 OR S37 OR S38 OR S39 OR S40 OR S41
	OR S42 OR S43 OR S44 OR S45 OR S46
48	S34 OR S47



Appendix 1. Presentation of the search strategy and results from the Pub Med database until 28th of May, 2019.

	Search block 3: Formative assessment	
#	MESH	
49	"Formative Feedback"[Mesh]	
#	Free text terms	
50	"Formative evaluation" OR	
51	"Formative feedback" OR	
52	"Formative assessment" OR	
53	"Formative* assess*" OR	
54	"Formativ* evaluation" OR	
55 57	Formative OR	
56	Tormative evaluation research	
57	S37 OP S38 OP S30 OP S40 OP S41 OP S42 OP S43	
58	S49 OR S57	
50	54) OK 557	1
#	Combination of search blocks 1, 2, and 3	
59	S29 AND S48 AND S58	

#	Combination of search blocks 1, 2, and 3
59	S29 AND S48 AND S58

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
10	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
20	
20	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	

60

Appendix 2. Charting form
CHARTING FORM
ARTICLE NO:
TITLE:
AUTHOR/S:
YEAR OF PUBLICATION:
COUNTRY:
RESEARCH DESIGN: QUANTITATIVE QUALITATIVE OTHER:
METHOD:
AIM:
NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS (n=):
<u>SETTING:</u>
MEDICAL EDUCATION
NURSING EDUCATION
MIDWIFERY EDUCATION
PHYSIOTHERAPY EDUCATION
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY
DENTAL EDUCATION
OTHER

2			
3	DOES THE STUDY PRESENT?		
4 5	HOW PEER ASSESSEMENT	YES	NO
6 7	INTERVENTIONS ARE DELIVERED		
8 9 10 11	PEER ASSESSMENT	YES	NO
12 13 14 15	FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT	YES	NO
16 17 18 19	STUDENTS EXPERIENCE	YES	NO
20 21 22	TEACHERS EXPERIENCE	YES	NO
23 24 25 26 27	OUTCOME/S OF PEER ASSESSMENT	YES	NO
28 29 30 31 32 33	RATIONALE/S FOR PEER ASSESSMENT	YES	NO
34 35 36 37 38	MAIN FINDINGS:		
39 40 41	INCLUDED:	YES	NO
42 43 44 45 46	REASON/S FOR EXCLUSION:		
47 48 49			

OTHER:

BMJ Open



Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #		
TITLE					
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	1		
ABSTRACT					
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	2		
INTRODUCTION					
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	3, 4		
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	5		
METHODS					
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	4,13		
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	5, Table 1		
Information sources*	7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	6, Appendix 1		
Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Appendix 1		
Selection of sources of evidence†	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	6,7		
Data charting process‡	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	6,7, Appendix 2		
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made	5, Appendix 1		
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence§	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	6, 7		



St. Michael's

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-045345 on 9 February 2021. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on May 14, 2025 at Department GEZ-LTA Erasmushogeschool .

rasmushogeschool

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	6,7
RESULTS			
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	5,6, Figure 1
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	7, Table 2
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	Table 2
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	7,8,9,10, Table 2
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	8,9,10, Table 3
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	10, 11
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	12
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	11, 12
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	12

IBI = Joanna Briggs Institute; PRISMA-ScR = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews.

* Where sources of evidence (see second footnote) are compiled from, such as bibliographic databases, social media platforms, and Web sites.

† A more inclusive/heterogeneous term used to account for the different types of evidence or data sources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy documents) that may be eligible in a scoping review as opposed to only studies. This is not to be confused with information sources (see first footnote).

‡ The frameworks by Arksey and O'Malley (6) and Levac and colleagues (7) and the JBI guidance (4, 5) refer to the process of data extraction in a scoping review as data charting.

§ The process of systematically examining research evidence to assess its validity, results, and relevance before using it to inform a decision. This term is used for items 12 and 19 instead of "risk of bias" (which is more applicable to systematic reviews of interventions) to include and acknowledge the various sources of evidence that may be used in a scoping review (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy document).

From: Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. Ann Intern Med. ;169:467-473. doi: 10.7326/M18-0850



BMJ Open

Formative Peer Assessment in Higher Healthcare Education Programs – a Scoping Review

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-045345.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Dec-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Stenberg, Marie; Malmo Universitet, Care Science Mangrio, Elisabeth; Malmo Universitet, Care Science Bengtsson, Mariette; Malmo Universitet, Care Science Carlson, Elisabeth; Malmo Universitet,
Primary Subject Heading :	Medical education and training
Secondary Subject Heading:	Medical education and training
Keywords:	MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING, EDUCATION & TRAINING (see Medical Education & Training), Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT
	·





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies



Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

1		
2		
3 1	1	
4 5		
5	2	
0		
/	C	
0	3	
9 10		
10	4	Formative Peer Assessment in Higher Healthcare Education Programs – a
11		e e
12	5	Scoping Review
13		
15	~	
15	6	
17		
18	7	
19	,	
20		
20	8	Marie Stenberg ¹ RN; MNSc marie.stenberg@mau.se
22		
23	9	Elisabeth Mangrio ¹ RN PhD Associate Professor elisabeth mangrio@mau.se
24	5	Ensubern multiplie fill, i ins, i isobeliate i foressor <u>ensubernimultiplie entudise</u>
25		
26	10	Mariette Bengtsson ¹ RN, PhD, Associate Professor <u>mariette.bengtsson@mau.se</u>
27		
28	11	Elisabeth Carlson ¹ RN PhD Professor elisabeth carlson@mau.se
29		Ensure of Carloon 11(, 1 hb, 11010501 ensure (notification) endered
30		
31	12	
32		
33	13	
34		
35		
36	14	Department of Care Science, Faculty of Health and Society, Malmo
37	15	University SE 205.06 Sweden
38	10	
39		
40	16	Corresponding author: Elisabeth Carlson, Faculty of Health and Society, Jan
41	17	Waldanströmag 25. Malmä University, SE 214 29 Malmä, Sweden
42	17	waldenstromsg 25, Wallio Oniversity, SE 214 28 Wallio, Sweden
43		
44	18	Tel: +46 40 665 79 44
45		
46	10	E Mail: maria stanharg@may so
47	19	E-Mail. <u>maile.stenderg(<i>w</i>)mau.se</u>
48		
49	20	Word count: 3746
50		
51	21	
52	21	
53	22	
54	22	
55		
56	23	
57		
58	24	
59	-	
60		

1 2		
2 3 4	25	ABSTRACT
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	26	Objectives: Formative peer assessment focus on learning and development of the student
	27	learning process. This implies that students are taking responsibility for assessing the work of
	28	their peers by giving and receiving feedback to each other. The aim was to compile research
	29	about formative peer assessment presented in higher healthcare education, focusing on the
	30	rationale, the interventions, the experiences of students and teachers and the outcomes of
	31	formative assessment interventions.
	32	Design: A scoping review.
	33	Data sources: Searches were conducted until May 2019 in PubMed, CINAHL, ERIC, and
	34	ERC. Grey literature was searched in Lib-search, Google Scholar and Science Direct.
	35	Eligibility criteria: Studies addressing formative peer assessment in higher education,
25	36	focusing on medicine, nursing, midwifery, dentistry, physical or occupational therapy, and
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46	37	radiology published in peer reviewed articles or in grey literature.
	38	Data extractions and synthesis: Out of 1452 studies, 37 met the inclusion criteria and were
	39	critically appraised using relevant CASP, JBI and MMAT tools. The pertinent data was
	40	analyzed using thematic analysis.
	41	Result: The critical appraisal resulted in 18 included studies with high and moderate
	42	quality. The rationale for using formative peer assessment relates to giving and receiving
	43	constructive feedback as a means to promote learning. The experience and outcome of
	44	formative peer assessment interventions from the perspective of students and teachers are
	45	presented within three themes; 1/organization and structure of the formative peer
	46	assessment activities, 2/ personal attributes and consequences for oneself and
	47	relationships and 3/ experience and outcome of feedback and learning.
47 48	48	Conclusion: Healthcare education must consider preparing and introducing students to
49 50	49	collaborative learning, and thus develop well-designed learning activities aligned with the
50 51 52 53 54 55	50	learning outcomes. Since peer collaboration seems to affect students' and teachers'
	51	experiences of formative peer assessment, empirical investigations exploring collaboration
	52	between students are of utmost importance.
56 57	53	Keywords: Feedback, formative assessment, healthcare education, peer assessment, students,
58 59 60	54	teachers

1 2		
2 3	55	
4	55	
5 6	56	
7		
8 9	57	
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37	58	STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY
	59	• The current scoping review is previously presented in a published study protocol.
	60	• Four databases were systematically searched to identify research on formative peer
	61	assessment.
	62	• Critical appraisal tools were used to assess the quality of studies with quantitative
	63	qualitative and mixed methods designs
	05	
	64	• Articles appraised as high or moderate quality were included.
	65	• Since only English studies were included, studies may have been missed that would
	66	otherwise have met the inclusion criteria.
	67	
	68	BACKGROUND
	60	
	69	Peer assessment is an educational approach where feedback, communication, reflection, and
	70	collaboration between peers are key characteristics. In a peer assessment activity, students
	71	take responsibility for assessing the work of their peers by giving (and receiving) feedback on
	72	a specific subject. ¹ It allows students to consider the learning outcomes for peers of similar
38	73	status and to reflect upon their own learning mirrored in a peer. ² Peer assessment has shown
39 40	74	to support students' development of judgement skills, critiquing abilities, and self-awareness
41 42	75	as well as their understanding of the assessment criteria used in a course. ¹ In higher education,
43	76	peer assessment has been a way to move from an individualistic and teacher-led approach to a
44 45	77	more collaborative, student-centred approach to assessment ¹ aligned with social
46 47	78	constructivism principles. ³ In this social context of interaction and collaboration, students can
48 40	79	expand their knowledge, identify their strengths and weaknesses, and develop personal and
49 50	80	professional skills ⁴ by evaluating the professional competence of a peer. ⁵ Peer assessment can
51 52	81	be used in academic and professional settings as a strategy to enhance students' engagement
53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60	82	in their own learning.678 The collaborative aspect of peer assessment relates to professional
	83	teamwork, as well as to broader goals of lifelong learning. As argued by Boud et al., ¹ peer
	84	assessment addresses course-specific goals not readily developed otherwise. For healthcare
	85	professions, it enhances the ability to work in a team in a supportive and respectful
	86	atmosphere, ⁹ which is highly relevant for patient outcome and the reduction of errors

Page 5 of 31

BMJ Open

compromising patient safety.¹⁰ However, recent research has shown that peer collaboration is challenging¹¹ and that healthcare professionals are not prepared to deliver and receive feedback effectively.¹² This emphasizes the importance for healthcare educators to support students with activities fostering these competences. Feedback is highly associated with enhancing student learning¹³ and modifying learning during the learning process¹⁴ as a means for students to close the gap between their present state of learning and their desired goal(s). Peer feedback can be written or oral and conducted as peer observations in small or large groups.⁸ Further, it is driven by set assessment criteria,¹ which can be either summative or formative, formal or informal. Summative assessment evaluates students' success or failure after the learning process,¹⁵ whereas formative assessment aims for improvement during the learning process.^{16,4} According to Black and Wiliam,¹⁵ formative peer assessment activities involve feedback to modify the teaching and learning of the students. The intention of feedback is to help students help each other when planning their learning.⁴ ¹⁷ An informal formative peer assessment activity involves a continuous process throughout a course or education, whereas a formal one is designated to a single point in a course momentum. Earlier research on peer assessment in healthcare education has provided an overview of specific areas within the peer assessment process. For example, Speyer, Pilz, and Van Der Kruis presented psychometric characteristics of peer assessment instruments and questionnaires in medical education,¹⁸ concluding that quite a few instruments exist; however, these intruments mainly focus on professional behavior, and they lack sufficient psychometric data. Tornwall¹² focused on how nursing students were prepared by academics to participate in peer assessment activities and highlighted the importance of creating a supporting learning environment. Lerchenfeldt, Mi and Eng¹⁹ concluded that peer assessment supports medical students in developing professional behavior and that peer feedback is a way to assess professionalism. Khan, Payne, and Chahine²⁰ reviewed the role of peer assessment in objective structured clinical examinations (OSCE), showing that peer assessment promotes learning but that students need training in how to provide feedback. In short, the existing literature contributes valuable knowledge about formative peer assessment in healthcare education targeting specific areas. However, there seems to be a lack of compiled research considering formative peer assessment in its entirety, including the context, rationale, experience, and outcome of the formative peer assessment process. Therefore, this scoping review attempts to present an overview of formative peer assessment in healthcare education rather than specific areas within that process.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.
120 METHOD

This scoping review was conducted using the York methodology by Arksey and O'Malley ²¹
and the recommendations presented by Levac, Colquhuan, and O'Brien.²² We constructed a
scoping protocol, utilizing a PRISMA-P protocol, to present the planned methodology for the
scoping review.²³

125 Aim and research questions

We aimed to compile research about formative peer assessment presented in higher healthcare education. The research questions were as follows: What are the rationales for using formative peer assessment in healthcare education? How are formative peer assessment interventions delivered in healthcare education and in what context? What experiences of formative peer assessment do students and teachers in healthcare education have? What are the outcomes of formative peer assessment interventions? We used the "Population Concept and Context" (PCC) elements recommended for scoping reviews to establish effective search criteria (Table 1).²⁴

30 134

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

135 Relevant studies identified

The literature search was conducted in the databases PubMed, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL), Education Research Complete (ERIC), and Education Research Centre (ERC). Search tools such as Medical Subject Headings, Headings, Thesaurus and Boolean operators (AND/OR) helped expand and narrow the search. Initially, the search terms were broad (e.g., peer assessment or higher education) in order to capture the range of published literature. However, the extensiveness of the material made it necessary to narrow the search terms and organize them in three major blocks. The following inclusion criteria were applied in the search: (a) articles addressing formative peer assessment in higher education; (b) students and teachers in medicine, nursing, midwifery, dentistry, physical or occupational therapy, and radiology; and (c) peer reviewed articles, grey literature (books, discussion papers, posters et cetera). Studies of summative peer assessment, instrument development, and systematic reviews were excluded. We incorporated several similar terms related to peer assessment in the search to ensure that no studies were missed (Appendix 1). Furthermore, we consulted a well-versed librarian with experience of systematic search²⁵ to assist us in systematically identifying relevant databases and search terms for each database,

Page 7 of 31

BMJ Open

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

control the relevance of the constructed search blocks, and manage the data in a reference
management system. No limitation was set for year, all studies indexed in the four databases
were included until the last search May 28th, 2019.

9 154

10 155 Study selection

The process of the study selection and the reasons for exclusion are presented in a flow diagram²⁶ (Figure 1). First, the first author (MS) screened all 1,452 titles. Second, MS read all the abstracts, gave those responding to the research questions a unique code, and organized them in a reference management system. The reason for inclusion and exclusion at title and abstract level was charted by the first author and critically discussed within the team (MS, EM, MB, EC). An additional hand search of reference lists was conducted. To cover a subject in full, a scoping review should include search in grey literature.^{21 22} Therefore, the grey literature was scoped to find unpublished results by searching Google Scholar, LibSearch, and Science Direct. The grey literature mostly contained research posters, conference abstracts, discussion papers, and books, but a hand search revealed original research articles that were added for further screening and appraisal. Finally, the first author (MS) arrived at 81 studies, read them in full-text, and discussed them with the other three authors (EM, MB, EC). **INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE**

169 Charting the data

We constructed a charting form to facilitate the screening of the full-text studies (Appendix 2). Out of the 81 studies, 37 met the inclusion criteria and were appraised for quality using Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP).²⁷ The reason for conducting a critical appraisal of the studies was to enhance the use of the findings for policy-making and practice in higher healthcare education.²⁸ To investigate the interpretation of the quality instruments, three members of the research team (MS, EM, EC) conducted an initial test assessment of two randomly selected studies and graded them with high, moderate, or low quality. Additional screening tools were used for studies with a mixed methods design²⁹ and cross-sectional studies³⁰ not available in CASP. When a discrepancy arose, a fourth researcher (MB) assessed the articles independently without prior knowledge of what the others have concluded. This was followed by a discussion among all four researchers to secure internal agreement on how to further interpret the checklist items and the quality assessments. Consequently, to ensure high quality, the studies had to have a "yes" answer for a majority of the questions. If "no" dominated, the study was excluded. Since earlier reports³¹ have raised and discussed the

BMJ Open

importance of ethical issues in systematic reviews, all screening protocols in this review included ethical considerations, as an individual criterion. The first author critically appraised all 37 articles, and 15 articles were divided between the team members (EM, MB, EC) and independently appraised. Nevertheless, during the screening process all 37 articles were critically discussed using the Rayvan system for systematic reviews³² before final descision for inclusion. By this procedure, all authors agreed on not only which articles to include, but also the reason for exclusion. The critical appraisal resulted in 18 studies with high and moderate quality (Table 2).

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

²⁰ 194 **Collating, summarizing, and reporting results**

The analysis process followed the five phases of thematic analysis described by Braun and Clarke,³³ with support of a practical guide provided by Maguire & Delahunt.³⁴ The first phase included familiarizing with the data. Therefore, prior to the coding process, we read all the articles to grasp a first impression of the results presented within the included studies. We then conducted a theoretical thematic analysis, meaning that the results were deductively coded,³³ guided by the research questions. We read the results a second time before starting the initial coding. The codes consisted of short descriptions close to the original text. The codes were then combined into themes and sub-themes. The themes were identified with a semantic approach, meaning that they were explicit: we did not look for anything beyond what was written.³³ Finally, we constructed a thematic map to present an overview of the results and how the themes related to each other. The results from the studies are presented narratively.

207 Consultation

 Consultation is an optional stage in scoping reviews.²¹ However, since it adds methodologic rigor,²² we presented and discussed the preliminary results and the thematic map with nine academic teachers who are experts within the field of healthcare education and pedagogy. The purpose of the consultation was to enhance the validity of the results of the scoping review and to facilitate appropriate dissemination of outputs.³³ The expert group responded to four questions: Do the themes make sense? Is too much data included in one single theme? Are the themes distinct or do they overlap? Are there themes within themes?³⁴ The consultation resulted in a revision of a few themes and the way they related to each other.

RESULTS

The 18 included studies were published between 2002 and 2017 in the United States (6), the United Kingdom (6), Australia (3), Canada (2), and the United Arab Emirate (1) (Table 3). The studies were conducted in medical (12), dental (2), nursing (2), occupational therapy (1), and radiography (1) educations. Six studies were presented in the framework of an existing collaborative educational model.^{35-37 38 39 40} Our review revealed that the most frequent setting for formative peer assessment activities is within clinical skill-training courses, 35 39-47 involving intra-professional peers. The common rationale for using formative peer assessment is to support students, usually explained by the inherent learning of the feedback process,^{35,39} ^{40 43-45 47-51} and to prepare students for professional behavior and provide them with the skills required in the health care professions.^{36 37 38 46 47 48 49 52} Table 3 presents the results of the analysis related to the research questions of context, rationale, and interventions of formative peer assessment.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

The results related to the research questions about the experience of students and teachers and the outcome of formative peer assessment interventions fall within three themes: (1) the organization and structure of peer assessment activities, (2) personal attributes and consequences for oneself and one's peer relationships, and (3) the experience and outcome of feedback and learning.

238 The organization and structure of formative peer assessment activities

In the reviewed studies, students express that the responsibility of faculty is a key component in formative peer assessment, meaning that faculty must clearly state the aim of the peer assessment activity. Students highlight the need to be prepared and trained in how to give and receive constructive feedback.^{36 47 50-52} The learning activities need to be well-designed and supported by guidelines on how to use them.^{35 36 50 52} Otherwise, it could discourage students from participating in the peer activities.⁵² Novice students find it difficult to be objective and to offer constructive criticism in a group.^{36 46} This emphasizes the importance of responsibility from faculty, especially when students are to give feedback on professional behavior.⁵² Some students prefer direct communication with peers when feedback is negative, whereas others think it is the responsibility of faculty.⁵² There is some ambiguity regarding whether feedback should be given

anonymously or not,^{47 52} whether it should bear consequences from faculty or not,⁵² whether it should be informal or formal, and whether the peer should be at the same academic level or at a more experienced higher-level.^{50 52} Moreover, some students express how they favor small groups;^{41 49} as students in small groups are more active than those in large groups.⁴¹ Students and teachers agree that peer assessment should be strictly formative rather than summative.^{42 46 52} Teachers see themselves as key facilitators and express that students value feedback from teachers rather than from peers (in terms of credibility).⁵¹ Students express similar sentiments even if they appreciate the peer feedback.^{40 42 44 46} However, teachers confirm the need for training and preparing students early in the education, as well as the need for their own professional development to guide students effectively.⁵¹

Personal attributes and the impact and consequences for oneself and one's peer relationships

Students generally focus on how peer assessment activities may affect their personal relationships in a negative way.^{35 37 42 50 52} They express worry over consequences for themselves and their social relationships^{37 40 52} as well as feeling anxious that negative feedback given to a peer may affect the grading from faculty.⁵² Moreover, students emphasize the importance of enthusiasm and engagement in listening to peers' opinions during their collaboration.^{36 47} They mention positive personal attributes and behaviors such as being organized, polite, and helpful as supportive for peer collaboration.^{36 47} Further, they mention the importance of both a positive and close relationship between students and faculty⁵² and a positive culture in the learning environment.⁴⁰ While students highlight the impact on and consequences for personal relationships, teachers speak of the importance of respect in formative peer assessment,³⁶ including respect for each other, the learning activity, and the collaboration and interaction.³⁶ Further, teachers emphasize the importance of students being self-aware, being well prepared, and taking own responsibility for the peer assessment activity.³⁶

The experience and outcome of feedback and learning

According to the students in the reviewed studies, formative peer assessment contributes to developing the skills needed in practice and in their future profession.^{35 36 40 41 48 52} They appreciate the opportunity to give and receive feedback from a peer,^{35 36 40 42 47 48 50} and they agree that the feedback they received made them change how they worked^{42 48} or

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Page 11 of 31

BMJ Open

how they taught their peers.^{47 48} They consider activities such as observation of others' performance as beneficial for learning because they make them reflect on their own performance^{35 36 40 41 46 49 50} and help them identify knowledge gaps.^{35 40 49} Students with prior experience of peer learning are more likely to provide specific guiding feedback than those without such experiences.³⁹ Moreover, two studies showed significantly improved test results for students who took part in a peer feedback activity compared to those who did not.4349 Further, students thought hey could be honest in their feedback and would learn better if the feedback was more in-depth.^{35 46} Students at entry level tend to give more positive feedback than senior students; they also focus on practical and clinical knowledge, whereas more senior students focus on communication, management, and leadership in their feedback comments.⁴⁵ A study exploring what students remember of received feedback points to memories of positive growth, negative self-image, and negative attitudes toward classmates. Received feedback sometimes confirmed personal traits the students already knew about.³⁷ In addition, negative feedback was more likely to result in a change in their work habits and interpersonal attributes.³⁷ Students expressed some anxiety regarding the usefulness of feedback from low-performing students^{40 50} and non-motivated students, which contributes to ineffective interaction and learning.^{36 47} Low performing students show lack of initiative, preparation, and respect but also improvement in their grades after the peer assessment experience.⁴⁷ Furthermore, feedback from peers can be a predictor of a student's unprofessional behavior; hence, it could be used as a tool for early remediation.³⁸ In an evaluation of faculty examiners' experience of students' feedback, the faculty express how they consider student feedback to be given in a professional and appropriate way and faculty examiners would have given similar feedback.⁴² In an OSCE-examination where a checklist was used, the results showed statistical significance in assessment between faculty examiners and student examiners.42

DISCUSSION

We conclude that formative peer assessment is a process with two consecutive phases. The first phase concerns the understanding of the rationale and fundament of the peer assessment process for students and faculty members. The results indicate that the rationale is to support student learning and prepare them for healthcare professions. The formative peer assessment activities support students' reflection on their own knowledge and development when mirrored in a peer by alternating the roles of observer and observed. ^{53 54} It further contributes

BMJ Open

to skills as communication, transfer of understandable knowledge and collaboration, all significant core competences when caring for patients and their relatives.⁵⁴ For faculty, organizing formative peer assessment, can be cost beneficial. This was recently emphasized in high volume classes expressing the reduction of costs with students giving feedback to a peer instead of teachers.⁵⁵ Nevertheless, students express the importance of clarifying the aim of the peer assessment activity and the responsibility of the faculty. We recommend faculty to clearly define the activity and explain how it supports student learning and professionalism, especially when students are to provide feedback to each other on sensitive matters, such as un-professional behavior. A collaborative activity between students requires trust, and the real intention must be made transparent. ^{4 56-58} Moreover, to enable student development in line with the learning outcomes, the learning activity needs to be well designed and understood by students.^{59 60 61} However, Casey et al.⁶² recommended further investigations of how to prepare students for the peer assessment activities.

The second phase concerns the organization and structure of the formative peer assessment activity, for example, how to give and receive feedback and the complexity of peer collaboration as it affects students' emotions concerning both themselves and their relationship with their peers. This coincides with earlier research emphasizing the social factors of peer assessment and the importance for teachers to consider them.⁴ Nevertheless, surprisingly, few studies highlight the collaborative part of peer assessment.⁴¹¹ One reason might be that formative peer assessment is often presented as a "stand alone" activity and not involved in a collaborative learning environment.⁸ ⁶³ We agree with earlier research⁶⁴ ⁶⁵ arguing that peer assessment needs to be affiliated with practices of collaborative learning. Similar implications are presented by Tornwall,¹² who concluded the importance of integrating peer collaboration as a natural approach throughout education to support student development.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Some have argued that research on peer assessment is deficient in referring to exactly what peer assessment aims to achieve.⁶⁶ We conclude that within healthcare education the aim of formative peer assessment is to prepare students for the collaborative aspects crucial within the healthcare professions. However, healthcare education must consider preparing and introducing students to collaborative learning; therefore, well-designed learning activities

Page 13 of 31

BMJ Open

aligned with the learning outcomes need to be developed. Based on this scoping review,
 formative peer assessment needs to be implemented in a collaborative learning environment
 throughout the education to be effective. However, since peer collaboration seems to affect
 students' and teachers' experience of formative peer assessment, empirical investigations
 exploring the collaboration between students are of utmost importance.

² 353 LIMITATIONS

Previous methodological concerns and discussions have been related to the systematic approach of handling grey literature.^{67 68} We argue that the grey literature may contribute to a wider understanding of the research area. Nevertheless, when we conducted a critical appraisal of the included studies, the grey literature was excluded due to lack of methodological rigor. Therefore, we recommend considering this time-consuming phase of the methodology in scoping reviews. We further acknowledge that the last search was conducted in May 2019, studies may have been included if an additional search had been provided after this date and in other databases than the ones presented. Further, the current scoping review has not fully elucidated the perspective of teachers and faculty. Few of the included studies highlighted the teachers' perspective why further research is required.

Authors' contribution: MS led the design, search strategy, and conceptualization of this work and drafted the manuscript. EM, MB, and EC were involved in the conceptualization of the review design, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and critical appraisal and provided feedback on the methodology and the manuscript. All authors give their approval to the publishing of this scoping review manuscript. Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Funding statement: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the
 public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

⁶ 371 **Competing interests:** None declared.

Patient and public involvement: As this is a scoping review no primary research has been
 373 conducted and thus not involve patients or the public.

Acknowledgement: Special thanks to the members in the expert group for their valuable contribution in the consultation.

Additional data: No data available. All data relevant to the study are included in the article
 or uploaded as supplementary information.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

3	378	Figure 1, PRISMA Flowchart
4		8

REFERENCES

1. Boud D, Cohen R, Sampson J. Peer learning and assessment. Assessment & evaluation in higher education 1999;24(4):413-26. 2. Topping KJ, Ehly SW. Peer assisted learning: A framework for consultation. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation 2001;12(2):113-32. 3. Vygotskiĭ LS. Thought and language: MIT press 2012. 4. Topping KJ. Peer Assessment. 2009:20-27. doi: 10.1080/00405840802577569 5. Dannefer EF, Henson LC, Bierer SB, et al. Peer assessment of professional competence. Medical *Education* 2005;39(7):713-22. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2929.2005.02193.x 6. Casey D, Burke E, Houghton C, et al. Use of peer assessment as a student engagement strategy in nurse education. Nursing & health sciences 2011;13(4):514-20. 7. Orsmond* P, Merry S, Callaghan A. Implementation of a formative assessment model incorporating peer and self-assessment. Innovations in Education and Teaching International 2004;41(3):273-90. 8. Ashenafi MM. Peer-assessment in higher education – twenty-first century practices, challenges and the way forward. Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 2017;42(2):226-51. doi: 10.1080/02602938.2015.1100711 9. Sims S, Hewitt G, Harris R. Evidence of collaboration, pooling of resources, learning and role blurring in interprofessional healthcare teams: a realist synthesis. Journal of Interprofessional care 2015;29(1):20-25. 10. Morley L, Cashell A. Collaboration in health care. Journal of medical imaging and radiation sciences 2017;48(2):207-16. 11. Stenberg M, Carlson E. Swedish student nurses' perception of peer learning as an educational model during clinical practice in a hospital setting—an evaluation study. BMC nursing 2015;14(1):48. 12. Tornwall J. Peer assessment practices in nurse education: An integrative review, 2018:266-75. 13. Nicol DJ, Macfarlane-Dick D. Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in higher education 2006;31(2):199-218. 14. Hudson JN, Bristow DR. Formative assessment can be fun as well as educational. Advances in physiology education 2006;30(1):33-37. doi: 10.1152/advan.00040.2005 15. Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: principles, policy & practice 1998;5(1):7-74. 16. Sadler DR. Beyond feedback: Developing student capability in complex appraisal. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 2010;35(5):535-50. 17. Topping K. Peer assessment between students in colleges and universities. Review of educational Research 1998;68(3):249-76. 18. Speyer R, Pilz W, Van Der Kruis J, et al. Reliability and validity of student peer assessment in medical education: a systematic review. Med Teach 2011;33(11):e572-85. doi: 10.3109/0142159X.2011.610835 [published Online First: 2011/10/26] 19. Lerchenfeldt S, Mi M, Eng M. The utilization of peer feedback during collaborative learning in undergraduate medical education: a systematic review. BMC medical education 2019;19(1):321. 20. Khan R, Payne MWC, Chahine S. Peer assessment in the objective structured clinical examination: A scoping review. Medical Teacher 2017;39(7):745-56. doi: 10.1080/0142159X.2017.1309375 21. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. International Journal of Social Research Methodology 2005;8(1):19-32. doi: 10.1080/1364557032000119616

2		
3	426	22. Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. Implementation
4	427	Science 2010;5(1):69. doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-5-69
5	428	23. Stenberg M, Mangrio E, Bengtsson M, et al. Formative peer assessment in healthcare education
0 7	429	programmes: protocol for a scoping review. <i>BMJ open</i> 2018;8(11):e025055-e55. doi:
, 8	430	10.1136/bmjopen-2018-025055
9	431	24. Peters M, Godfrey C, McInerney P, et al. Methodology for JBI scoping reviews. The Joanna Briggs
10	432	Institute Reviewers manual 2015: The Joanna Briggs Institute 2015:3-24.
11	433	25. Morris M, Boruff JT, Gore GC. Scoping reviews: establishing the role of the librarian. Journal of the
12	434	Medical Library Association: JMLA 2016;104(4):346.
13	435	26. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-
14	436	analyses: the PRISMA statement. Annals of internal medicine 2009;151(4):264-69.
15	437	27. Programme CAS. Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. CASP checklist 2018 [Available from:
10	438	https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-checklists/ accessed 5 august 2018.
18	439	28. Daudt HM, van Mossel C, Scott SJ. Enhancing the scoping study methodology: a large, inter-
19	440	professional team's experience with Arksey and O'Malley's framework. BMC medical
20	441	research methodology 2013;13(1):48.
21	442	29. Hong Q, Pluye P, Fàbregues S, et al. Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018: User
22	443	guide. Department of Family Medicine, McGuill Univertiy 2018
23	444	30. Institute JB. Critical Appraisal Tools [Available from: http://joannabriggs.org/research/critical-
24	445	appraisal-tools.html accessed 5 august 2018.
25 26	446	31. Weingarten MA, Paul M, Leibovici L. Assessing ethics of trials in systematic reviews. Bmj
20	447	2004;328(7446):1013-14.
28	448	32. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, et al. Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic
29	449	reviews. Systematic reviews 2016;5(1):210.
30	450	33. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative research in psychology
31	451	2006;3(2):77-101.
32	452	34. Maguire M, Delahunt B. Doing a thematic analysis: A practical, step-by-step guide for learning
33	453	and teaching scholars. AISHE-J: The All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher
34 25	454	Education 2017;9(3)
36	455	35. Cushing A, Abbott S, Lothian D, et al. Peer feedback as an aid to learning - What do we want?
37	456	Feedback. When do we want it? Now! <i>Medical Teacher</i> 2011;33(2) doi:
38	457	10.3109/0142159X.2011.542522
39	458	36. Iqbal M, Velan GM, O'Sullivan AJ, et al. Differential impact of student behaviours on group
40	459	interaction and collaborative learning: medical students' and tutors' perspectives. BMC
41	460	medical education 2016;16(1):217-17. doi: 10.1186/s12909-016-0730-1
42	461	37. Nofziger AC, Naumburg EH, Davis BJ, et al. Impact of peer assessment on the professional
43 44	462	development of medical students: a qualitative study. Academic medicine : journal of the
44	463	Association of American Medical Colleges 2010;85(1):140-47. doi:
46	464	10.1097/ACM.0b013e3181c47a5b
47	465	38. Emke AR, Cheng S, Chen L, et al. A Novel Approach to Assessing Professionalism in Preclinical
48	466	Medical Students Using Multisource Feedback Through Paired Self- and Peer Evaluations.
49	467	Teaching and Learning in Medicine 2017;29(4):402-10. doi: 10.1080/10401334.2017.1306446
50	468	39. Chou CL, Masters DE, Chang A, et al. Effects of longitudinal small-group learning on delivery and
51	469	receipt of communication skills feedback. <i>Medical Education</i> 2013;47(11):1073-79. doi:
52 52	470	10.1111/medu.12246
55 54	471	40. Tai JH-M, Canny BJ, Haines TP, et al. The role of peer-assisted learning in building evaluative
55	472	judgement: opportunities in clinical medical education. Advances in health sciences
56	473	education : theory and practice 2016;21(3):659-76. doi: 10.1007/s10459-015-9659-0
57	474	41. Cho Y, Je S, Yoon YS, et al. The effect of peer-group size on the delivery of feedback in basic life
58	475	support refresher training: A cluster randomized controlled trial. BMC Medical Education
59	476	2016;16(1):1-8. doi: 10.1186/s12909-016-0682-5
60		

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

3	477	42. Moineau G, Power B, Pion A-MJ, et al. Comparison of student examiner to faculty examiner
4	478	scoring and feedback in an OSCE. <i>Medical education</i> 2011;45(2):183-91. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
5	479	2923.2010.03800.x
6 7	480	43. Satterthwaite JD, Grey NJA. Peer-group assessment of pre-clinical operative skills in restorative
/ Q	481	dentistry and comparison with experienced assessors. European Journal of Dental Education
0 0	482	2008:12(2):99-102. doi: 10.1111/i.1600-0579.2008.00509.x
10	483	44. Vaughn CJ. Kim E. O'Sullivan P. et al. Peer video review and feedback improve performance in
11	484	hasic surgical skills. American Journal of Surgery 2016:211(2):355-60. doi:
12	485	10 1016/i amisurg 2015 08 034
13	486	45. Tricio I. Woolford M. Escudier M. Analysis of dental students' written peer feedback from a
14	487	prospective peer assessment protocol. Furonean Journal of Dental Education 2016;20(4):241-
15	488	47
16	489	46 Rees C Sheard C McPherson A Communication skills assessment: the perceptions of medical
1/	490	students at the University of Nottingham <i>Medical Education</i> 2002;36(9):868-78
1ð 10	490 491	47 Snandorfer L Puklus T Rose V et al. Peer assessment among first year medical students in
20	491 102	anatomy Angtomical sciences education 2014:7(2):144-52, doi: 10.1002/ase 1394
20	492	All Martin D. Erieson E. De Pau A. Three heads are better than one: a mixed methods study
22	495	48. Martin D, Thesen L, De Fau A. Three neads are better than one. a mixed methods study
23	494	today 2014:24/6):071 77 doi: 10.1016/i podt 2014.01.004
24	495	40 Mui Lim S. Bodger S. The use of interactive formative accessments with first year occupational
25	490	49. Mul Lilli S, Rouger S. The use of Interactive formative assessments with hist-year occupational therapy students. International Journal of Therapy and Bababilitation 2010;17(11):E76.96
26	497	EQ. Elshami W. Abdalla ME. Diagnostic radiography students' persentions of formative peer
27	490	50. Eisinanni W, Abdalla ME. Diagnostic radiography students perceptions of formative peer
28	499	assessment within a radiographic technique module. Radiography (London, England 1995)
29	500	2017;23(1):9-13. doi: 10.1016/j.radi.2016.06.001
30 31	501	51. Kon LC. Academic staff perspectives of formative assessment in nurse education. <i>Nurse education</i>
32	502	In practice 2010;10(4):205-09. doi: 10.1016/j.nepr.2009.08.007
33	503	52. Arnold L, Shue CK, Kritt B, et al. Medical students views on peer assessment of professionalism.
34	504	Journal of General Internal Medicine 2005;20(9):819-24. doi: 10.1111/J.1525-
35	505	
36	506	53. Carlson E, Stenberg M, Chan B, et al. Nursing as universal and recognisable: Nursing students
37	507	perceptions of learning outcomes from intercultural peer learning webinars: A qualitative
38	508	study. Nurse education today 2017;57:54-59.
39	509	54. Homberg A, Hundertmark J, Krause J, et al. Promoting medical competencies through a didactic
40 11	510	tutor qualification programme–a qualitative study based on the CanMEDS Physician
41 42	511	Competency Framework. BMC Medical Education 2019;19(1):1-8.
43	512	55. Schwill S, Fahrbach-Veeser J, Moeltner A, et al. Peers as OSCE assessors for junior medical
44	513	students—a review of routine use: a mixed methods study. BMC medical education
45	514	2020;20(1):1-12.
46	515	56. Vickerman P. Student perspectives on formative peer assessment : an attempt to deepen
47	516	learning ? 2009;34(2):221-30. doi: 10.1080/02602930801955986
48	517	57. Sluijsmans D, Prins F. A conceptual framework for integrating peer assessment in teacher
49	518	education. <i>Studies in Educational Evaluation</i> 2006;32(1):6-22.
50 E 1	519	58. Boud D, Falchikov N. Developing assessment for informing judgement. Rethinking assessment in
57	520	higher education: Learning for the longer term 2007:181-97.
53	521	59. Cassidy S. Developing employability skills : peer assessment in higher education. 2006 doi:
54	522	10.1108/00400910610705890
55	523	60. Solheim E, Plathe HS, Eide H. Nursing students' evaluation of a new feedback and reflection tool
56	524	for use in high-fidelity simulation – Formative assessment of clinical skills. A descriptive
57	525	quantitative research design. Nurse Education in Practice 2017;27:114-20. doi:
58	526	10.1016/j.nepr.2017.08.021
59	527	61. Topping KJ. Peer assessment. Theory into practice 2009;48(1):20-27.
60		

1		
2		
3	528	62. Casey D, Burke E, Houghton C, et al. Use of peer assessment as a student engagement strategy in
4 5	529	nurse education. <i>Nursing and Health Sciences</i> 2011;13(4):514-20. doi: 10.1111/j.1442-
6	530	2018.2011.00637.x
7	531	63. Papinczak T, Young L, Groves M, et al. An analysis of peer, self, and tutor assessment in problem-
8	532	based learning tutorials. <i>Med Teach</i> 2007;29(5):e122-32. doi: 10.1080/01421590701294323
9	533	[published Online First: 2007/09/22]
10	534	64. Kollar I, Fischer F. Peer assessment as collaborative learning: A cognitive perspective. Learning
11	535	and Instruction 2010;20(4):344-48.
12	536	65. Finn GM, Garner J. Twelve tips for implementing a successful peer assessment. Medical teacher
13	537	2011;33(6):443-46.
14	538	66. Jackel B, Pearce J, Radloff A, et al. Assessment and feedback in higher education.
15	539	67. Gentles SJ, Lokker C, McKibbon KA. Health information technology to facilitate communication
10	540	involving health care providers, caregivers, and pediatric patients: a scoping review. Journal
18	541	of medical Internet research 2010;12(2):e22.
19	542	68. Pham MT, Rajić A, Greig JD, et al. A scoping review of scoping reviews: advancing the approach
20	543	and enhancing the consistency. Research synthesis methods 2014;5(4):371-85.
21		
22	544	
23		
24	545	
25		
20	546	
28		
29	547	
30		
31	5/18	
32	540	
33	F 4 0	
34	549	
35 26		
30	550	
38		
39	551	
40		
41	552	
42		
43	553	
44 45		
45 46	554	
40 47		
48	555	
49	555	
50	FFC	
51	556	
52		
53	557	
54		
55	558	
50 57		
57	559	
59		
60	560	

561			
562			
563			

Table 1. The PCC mnemonic as recommended by the Joanna Briggs Institute

	Population	Concept	Context
	Students assessing students	Intervention, rationale, outcome, context, and students' and teachers' experience of formative peer assessment	Healthcare education programs in higher education
565	0,	L	
566			
567			
568			
569			
570			
571			
572			
572			
573			
574			
575			
576			
577			
570			
578			
579			
580			
581			

			BMJ Open	отјорен у соруг	
Table 2. Overview of inc	luded studies.			n-2020-045; ight, includ	
Author, year, country, and journal	Aim	Design	Participants	Main findings 6 5 6 9	
Arnold et al., 2005, ⁵² USA Journal of General Internal Medicine	Identify factors that encourage or discourage student participation in peer assessment	Qualitative Grounded theory Focus groups (16) at two medical schools	n=61, medical students in year 1, 3, and 4	The characteristics of the peer sessment system and the environment can encourage or discourage participation frames: (1) Students' struggle with per sessment, (2) Characteristics of a peer sessment system, and (3) Environmental factors	1
Cho et al., 2016, ⁴¹ England <i>BMC Medical</i> <i>Education</i>	Investigate the effect of peer- group size on competency- based skills	Quantitative Cluster RCT	n=115, medical students in year 6	Smaller groups (4.1) show the active and preferred than large groups (8.1). Group size did not impact score and at from the active and min from the active and the active and the active and at	
Chou et al., 2013, ³⁹ USA <i>Medical Education</i>	Examine the role of prior peer-learning relationships between students in their delivery and receipt of feedback on clinical communication skills	Mixed method Case-control Descriptive statistics Survey, video observations	n= 72 medical students in year 3 with prior peer learning relationships n=36 students in control group with no prior peer relationships.	Students with prior peer arming relationships more likely to previde specific corrective feedback than hose without prior relationships. No significant difference between groups regarding how feedback was received.	1
Cushing et al., 2011, ³⁵ United Kingdom <i>Medical Teacher</i>	Investigate the benefits of formative peer feedback in communication skills and develop a training programme in peer feedback	Mixed method Questionnaire (20 items) at two occasions with 6 months in between. Focus groups (5 medical- and 2 nurse students)	n=45 medical students in year 1 n=48 nursing students in year 1	Students valued the learning or portunity of both being examiner and beever. They preferred more in-depth Bedback and feedback from tutors. They expressed anxiety about giving negative geedback to a peer and had mixed viewe on giving feedback (relaxed or pressure and its use in clinical placements.	1
Elshami & Abdalla, 2017, ⁵⁰ United Arab Emirates <i>Radiography</i>	Assess perception of formative peer assessment	Qualitative Action research Focus groups (3) Content analysis	n=19 (24**) diagnostic radiography students in year 3	Formative peer assessment gives valuable feedback from same lever or more experienced peers. Need for training and detailed rubrics.	1
Emke et al., 2017, ³⁸ USA	Demonstrate that perceptual errors related to professionalism behaviors can be detected early through	Quantitative	n=246 medical students in year 2	Multiple peer assessments and feedback a tool predictor of unprofession behavior.	

			BMJ Open	6/bmjopen-2020 by copyright, i	
Teaching and Learning in Medicine	repeated multisource feedback			ncluding	
Iqbal et al., 2016, ³⁶ Australia <i>BMC Medical</i> <i>Education</i>	Explore students' and tutors' perception of key collaborative behaviors that impact collaborative learning and interaction	Qualitative Focus groups (5) with students Interviews (8) with teachers Thematic analysis	n= 22 medical students in year one and two n= 8 teachers	Being respectful, giving Bonst Lictive feedback, and being engaged and prepared had positive impact on both learning and group interaction. Passiveness unreliability, irresponsibility, and condescending attitudes and a begative impact on learning and ine addition. Similar results from teachers.	high
Koh, 2010, ⁵¹ United Kingdom Nurse Education in Practice	Explore how academic staff experience, understand, and interpret the process of formative assessment and feedback of theoretical assessment	Qualitative Phenomenology Semi-structured interviews (22) Thematic analysis	n=20 academic staff in nurse education	Teachers see themselves as the facilitators and think students prefer the facilitators Students are assumed to have the skill to peer assess and give feetback out are unprepared and need support and introduction early in education. Teachers need professional development themselves.	moderate
Mui Lim & Rodger, 2010. ⁴⁹ Australia International Journal of Therapy and Rehabilitation	Improve students learning through interactive formative assessment and student generated questions	Mixed methods Cohort study Evaluation questionnaire	n= 115 occupational therapy students in year 1 in 2009 compared with n= 98 students in 2008	Significant improvement in exams result from being part of interadive formative assessment, which is benaticiat for learning and identifying knowled gaps.	moderate
Martin, Friesen, & De Pau, 2014, ⁴⁸ Canada <i>Nurse Education</i> <i>Today</i>	Examine collaborative testing versus traditional test taking with undergraduate nursing students in a nine-station OSCE	Mixed method Cross over design Survey Focus groups	n=70 nursing students	Significantly higher scores in sollaborative testing than in traditional stating. Themes: (1) studying more/studying differently, (2)/ cognitive collectivism (3), "it stuck in my head better" (4), confidence, and (5) practicing how to hare knowledge and negotiate.	moderate
Moineau et al., 2011, ⁴² Canada <i>Medical Education</i>	Compare scores and experiences of formative assessment from faculty and senior students during OSCE- examinations	Quantitative Cross sectional Pre- and post- questionnaire	n=66 medical students in year 2 n=27 year 4 student examiners n=27 teaching doctors	Students (year 4) assessing students (year 2) with checklists in OSCE-examinations equally assessed compared to the culty members. A positive learning expressed from both students and faculty.	moderate
Nofziger et al., 2010, ³⁷	Investigate the impact of peer assessment on future	Qualitative	n=70 medical students in year 2	67% found peer assessment hapful, reassuring, or confirming something they	moderate
			19	EZ-LTA	

 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

			BMJ Open	bmjoper y copyri
				1-2020 ight, ir
USA Academic Medicine	professional development and students' experiences	Questionnaire and narrative comments Frequency count	n=48 in year 4	knew; 65% reported impertant transformations in awareness, stitudes, or behaviors because of per assessment. Change was more likely where feedback was specific and described an area for improvement.
Rees, Sheard, & McPherson, 2002, ⁴⁶ United Kingdom <i>Medical Education</i>	Explore students' perceptions of communication skill assessment	Qualitative Focus groups	n=7 medical students in year 1 n= 7 in year 2 n=10 in year 3 n= 5 in year 4 n=3 in year 5	Year 4 and 5 more positive than younger students. Opportunities than younger communication skills with the set of the level. Learning experience the set of the assessor. No constructive stricts from peers. Difficult to be objective and to give feedback.
Satterthwaite & Grey, 2008, ⁴³ United Kingdom European Journal of Dental Education	Investigate if any differences existed between marks given by a peer group and those given by experienced assessors	Quantitative Cross sectional	n=65 dental students	No significant difference no significant dif
Spandorfer et al., 2014, ⁴⁷ USA <i>Anatomical Science</i> <i>Education</i>	Determine whether peer assessment improves students work habits and interpersonal attributes and whether it is accepted by students, focusing on low performing students	Multi-methods Paired sample t-test Pearson correlation coefficients Survey- content analysis	n=267 medical students in year 1; follow-up in year 2	Significant improvement free bn-line peer feedback between test 1 and 29 Themes: (1) Initiative, (2) Communication, (3) Respect, (4) Preparation, and (5) Focus. Students prefer anonymous feedback from peers.
Tai et al., 2016, ⁴⁰ Australia Advances in Health Science Education	Investigate students' experience of peer-assisted learning.	Mixed methods Ethnographic Survey, observations, and interviews Thematic analysis	n=10 medical students in year 1 (observed) n=191 students in year 3 (survey)	Observing and giving feedback to peers contributed to learning, but students value feedback from teachers for valuation. Students want to preserve social relationships with peers; meretore, feedback is not so constructive Peers provide a supportive learning privinonment.
Tricio, Woolford, & Escudier, 2016, ⁴⁵ United Kingdom European Journal of Dental Education	Analyze written feedback provided as a part of a formative and structured peer assessment protocol.	Multi-methods Descriptive statistic Thematic analysis	n=40 dental students in year 2 in pre-clinical skills laboratory n=68 dental students in year 5 in clinic	Year 2 focuses on practical and clinical knowledge; in contrast, year Scouses comments on communication management, and leadership. Year 2 gives reore positive comments on peer performance than year 5.
			20	EZ-LT,

			BMJ Open	/bmjopen-20; by copyright,	
Vaughn et al., 2016, ⁴⁴ USA <i>The American Journal</i> of Surgery	Evaluate the use, quality, and quantity of peer video feedback and compare peers and faculty feedback.	Quantitative Cross sectional Paired t-test, Mann- Whitney statistic Survey	n=24 medical students***	Significant change in performance across periods in both groups. Paer for data across performed better at final assessment than faculty feedback group (not significant). Peers gave higher scores than taculty. No significant differences when using a checklist.	s 3 mo pup
*High equals majority of	items in the critical appraisal too	ls.		relate	
**24 students included in	1 the intervention, and 19 attended	I the focus group session.		021. 1 to t	
***12 students received f	faculty feedback, and 12 students	received peer feedback.		Dow ext a	
				ind d	
				aded ool . lata i	
				mini. ni	
				n htt ng, /	
				Al tra	
				unin ^m jop	
				g, an	
				nd sii	
				<u>ni</u> ģ	
				a z	
				n/ on l ar tech	
				n/ on May . ar technol	
				n/ on May 14, 2 ar technologie:	
				n/ on May 14, 2025 ar technologies.	
				n/ on May 14, 2025 at De ar technologies.	
				n/ on May 14, 2025 at Depar ar technologies.	
				n/ on May 14, 2025 at Departmer ar technologies.	
				n/ on May 14, 2025 at Department Gt ar technologies.	
			21	n/ on May 14, 2025 at Department GEZ-Li ar technologies.	

3 4

24

36/bmjopen-2020-045345 on 9 Fe

BMJ Open Table 3. Overview and summery of the context, rationale, and interventions of formative peer assessment presented in the included studies.

Contexts	Rationales	Interventions Ea man
Intra-professional students (17)*	Giving and receiving feeback supports student learning:	Introduction (in workshops):
Combination of medical and nursing	Promotes learning (8)	Preparations in giving and receive gedeedback (3)
students (1)	Enhances critical thinking (1)	Introduction of guidelines or cheeklists to guide the peer assessor (3)
	Promotes understanding of the assessment process (1)	Introduction of the learning active $\nabla \nabla \Sigma$
Conducted in the following:	Develops critical- and interpersonal skills (1)	Preparation in communication
Clinical skill labs (11)	Helps identify knowledge gaps (1)	nd
Theoretical courses (7)	Supports low-performance students (1)	Learning activities focusing fe
Combination of theoretical and		Clinical skills (3)
clinical placement course (1)	It prepares students for knowledge-related professionalism in	Collaborative behavior (2) $\mathbf{B} \cdot \mathbf{H}$
-	the healthcare profession by helping them identify the	Clinical reasoning (2) Ξ g
	following:	Theoretical knowledge (2)
Within an educational model as	Professional- and un-professional behavior (6)	Communication skills (2) \rightarrow
problem-based learning, peer learning,	Clinical competence (2)	Management skills (1)
or peer assisted learning (7)	Technical skills (2)	
	Communication skills (2)	Feedback types:
	Collaborative behavior (2)	Face-to-face (7)
	Evaluative judgement (1)	Anonymous (5)
		Written (3) or through observations 3)
	It enhances teachers' teaching (1)	Interactive on-line assessment (2)
		Grading of the given feedback $\underline{2}$)
	It provides cost benefits:	
	Students as assessors instead of teachers (2)	Random peers (8)
	Students as creators of the learning activities instead of	Ability to choose peer (1) \mathbf{S}
	teachers (1)	In small groups $< 6(6)$
		In large groups $> 6(3)$ $\overline{0}$
		yie , 2
= appears in how many of the included	18 studies	s. 202
**		ίň
		at
		De
		pa
		ner
		l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l
		ନ ମ
		Ň
	22	5

to peet teriew only



100x122mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Erasmushogeschool Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

	Search block 1: Healthcare education			
#	MESH-terms			
1	"Students, Medical"[Mesh] OR			
2	"Students, Nursing"[Mesh] OR			
3	"Students, Dental" [Mesh] OR			
4	"Students, Health Occupations" [Mesh] OR			
5	"Education, Medical" [Mesh] OR			
6	"Education, Nursing" [Mesh] OR			
7	"Education, Dental" [Mesh] OR			
8	"Midwifery/education"[Mesh] OR			
9	"Allied Health Personnel/education"[Mesh]			
10	S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4 OR S5 OR S6 OR S7 OR S8			
	OR S9			
#	Free text terms			
11	"medical student*" OR			
12	"nursing student*" OR			
13	"midwifery student* OR			
14	"dental student*" OR			
15	"physical therapy student*" OR			
16	"occupational therapy student*" OR			
17	"allied health student*" OR			
18	"health occupations student*" OR			
19	"health care stud*" OR			
20	"Health care education" OR			
21	"health science education" OR			
22	"Medical education" OR			
23	"Nursing education" OR			
24	"Dental education" OR			
25	"allied health education" OR			
26	"Health occupation* education*" OR			
27	"midwifery education"			
•				
28	S11 OK S12 OK S13 OK S14 OKS15 OK S16 OK S17			
	OR \$18 OR \$19 OR \$20 OR \$21 OR \$22 OR \$23 OR			
•	S24 OR S25 OR S26 OR S27			
29	S10 OR S28			
	Search block 2: Peer assessment			

	Search block 2: Peer assessment		
#	MESH		
31	"Educational Measurement"[Mesh] OR		
32	"Peer Group"[Mesh] OR		
33	"Peer Review"[Mesh]		
34	S31 OR S32 OR S33		
#	Free text terms		
35	"peer assessment" OR		
36	"peer evaluation" OR		
37	"peer observation" OR		
38	"peer feedback" OR		
39	"peer review" OR		
40	"peer assess*" OR		
41	"*peer assess" OR		
42	"peer examiner" OR		
43	"peer grad*" OR		
44	"peer group" OR		
45	"Student performance appraisal" OR		
46	"educational measurement"		
47	S35 OR S36 OR S37 OR S38 OR S39 OR S40 OR S41		
	OR S42 OR S43 OR S44 OR S45 OR S46		
48	S34 OR S47		



Appendix 1. Presentation of the search strategy and results from the Pub Med database until 28th of May, 2019.

	Search block 3: Formative assessment	
#	MESH	
49	"Formative Feedback"[Mesh]	
#	Free text terms	
50	"Formative evaluation" OR	
51	"Formative feedback" OR	
52	"Formative assessment" OR	
53	"Formative* assess*" OR	
54	"Formative evaluation" OR	
55 56	Formativ* OR	
56	Tormative evaluation research	
57	S37 OP S38 OP S30 OP S40 OP S41 OP S42 OP S43	
58	\$49 OR \$57	
50	54) OK 557	
#	Combination of search blocks 1, 2, and 3	
59	S29 AND S48 AND S58	

#	Combination of search blocks 1, 2, and 3
59	S29 AND S48 AND S58

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

3
4
5
6
7
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
10
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
20
20
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
<u>4</u> 0
50
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
~ ~

60

Appendix 2. Charting form				
CHARTING FORM				
ARTICLE NO:				
TITLE:				
AUTHOR/S:				
YEAR OF PUBLICATION:				
COUNTRY:				
RESEARCH DESIGN: QUANTITATIVE QUALITATIVE OTHER:				
METHOD:				
AIM:				
NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS (n=):				
<u>SETTING:</u>				
MEDICAL EDUCATION				
NURSING EDUCATION				
MIDWIFERY EDUCATION				
PHYSIOTHERAPY EDUCATION				
OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY				
DENTAL EDUCATION				
OTHER				

2			
3	DOES THE STUDY PRESENT?		
4 5	HOW PEER ASSESSEMENT	YES	NO
6 7	INTERVENTIONS ARE DELIVERED		
8 9 10 11	PEER ASSESSMENT	YES	NO
12 13 14 15	FORMATIVE ASSESSMENT	YES	NO
16 17 18 19	STUDENTS EXPERIENCE	YES	NO
20 21 22	TEACHERS EXPERIENCE	YES	NO
23 24 25 26 27	OUTCOME/S OF PEER ASSESSMENT	YES	NO
28 29 30 31 32 33	RATIONALE/S FOR PEER ASSESSMENT	YES	NO
34 35 36 37 38	MAIN FINDINGS:		
39 40 41	INCLUDED:	YES	NO
42 43 44 45 46	REASON/S FOR EXCLUSION:		
47 48 49			

OTHER:

BMJ Open



Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist

SECTION ITEM PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM		REPORTED ON PAGE #	
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	3, 4
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	5
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	4,13
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	5, Table 1
Information sources*	Information sources* 7 Describe all information sources databases with dates of coverage authors to identify additional sources databases with dates of coverage authors to identify additional sources		6, Appendix 1
Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Appendix 1
Selection of sources of evidence†	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	6,7
Data charting process‡	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	6,7, Appendix 2
Data items 1		List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made	5, Appendix 1
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence§	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	6, 7



St. Michael's

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-045345 on 9 February 2021. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on May 14, 2025 at Department GEZ-LTA Erasmushogeschool .

rasmushogeschool

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	6,7
RESULTS			
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	5,6, Figure 1
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	7, Table 2
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	Table 2
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	7,8,9,10, Table 2
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	8,9,10, Table 3
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	10, 11
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	12
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	11, 12
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	12

IBI = Joanna Briggs Institute; PRISMA-ScR = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews.

* Where sources of evidence (see second footnote) are compiled from, such as bibliographic databases, social media platforms, and Web sites.

† A more inclusive/heterogeneous term used to account for the different types of evidence or data sources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy documents) that may be eligible in a scoping review as opposed to only studies. This is not to be confused with information sources (see first footnote).

‡ The frameworks by Arksey and O'Malley (6) and Levac and colleagues (7) and the JBI guidance (4, 5) refer to the process of data extraction in a scoping review as data charting.

§ The process of systematically examining research evidence to assess its validity, results, and relevance before using it to inform a decision. This term is used for items 12 and 19 instead of "risk of bias" (which is more applicable to systematic reviews of interventions) to include and acknowledge the various sources of evidence that may be used in a scoping review (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy document).

From: Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. Ann Intern Med. ;169:467-473. doi: 10.7326/M18-0850

