

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Possibilities for interprofessional learning at a Swedish acute health-care ward not dedicated to interprofessional education: an ethnographic study
AUTHORS	Martinell, Ann; Hult, Håkan; Henriksson, Peter; Kiessling, Anna

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Sue Pullon University of Otago
REVIEW RETURNED	10-Dec-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Overall</p> <p>An interesting study that adds to knowledge and understanding of the clinical workplace as a learning environment. Well worth publishing but some re-organisation would make the paper easier to understand. The ethnographic approach enabling direct observation of student and clinician behaviour in real-time is a strength.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Good introduction to the topic area and helpful use of the terms 'interprofessional education (IPE)' and 'interprofessional learning (IPL)'. However many readers will not necessarily be immediately familiar with these differences, so define these terms more clearly in the introduction. The later section labelled 'Methods Discussion' currently reads like an extraction from a thesis, and would in my view be better greatly shortened and woven into this Background/Introduction section. Good referencing to ethnographic methods per se, and a brief description of the power of direct observation of behaviour would suffice, followed by a justification of the choice of method in the first part of the Methods section. This will make the manuscript far more succinct and readable.</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>As above, I suggest opening this main Methods section with a short subsection on the choice of this particular ethnographic method, including the 'marginal participant' technique, in relation to the research question, and a brief description of what an ethnographic approach is – its key strengths and shortfalls. For example, you write "An ethnographic study design was chosen to explore the research question in depth" – but why? Explaining this point should then lead logically into the following subsections of data collection, analysis etc.</p> <p>Some more detail about how the data were collected is needed – for example, you state that data was collected on consecutive days, but how do we know as readers that the days the researcher was 'unavailable' were days where she/he anticipated particular difficulties or specific situations?</p>
-------------------------	---

	<p>Results</p> <p>This descriptive section would benefit from rewriting to both describe and initially interpret the data under the provisional headings 'learning with', 'learning from' etc. Currently some of this interpretation is in, or repeated in, the Discussion section, and would be better moved here.</p> <p>Results were deliberately looked at via an IPE lens. Even so, were the observers unduly biased as to what they thought they would find at the outset?</p> <p>Some of the quotes need better introduction, as the link with the preceding text is often not clear.</p> <p>Tables</p> <p>Table 1 is very useful and should be retained, but what I take to be Table 2 – describing different analytic Domains – is confusing without adequate caption and explanation in the text. This level of detail is probably not necessary in the main paper – but it could be available as supplementary additional material if this option is available.</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>As above, the Discussion section should primarily discuss the implication of the findings for IPE and IPL more widely and in comparison to others' findings. Are there other comparable 'direct observation' studies in uni-professional learning?</p> <p>The limitation discussed here should be limitations of this particular study, not the limitations of ethnography as a methodology – see comments above</p> <p>Serendipitous learning is a common feature of much clinical placement work – how do the findings from this study contribute to this discourse? For instance, consider this concept: IP Learning can be formal and expected and assessed in a variety of clinical contexts, not only in wards dedicated to IPE</p> <p>There also needs to be more explanation and discussion about the impact on the research of the widely different length of placements for medical and nursing students, as this is a common situation. Might the very short medical student placement length be key to the lack of meaningful IPL – discuss.</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>Design and setting – give the location of the study and the time frame for the data collection</p> <p>Strengths and limitations subsection</p> <p>As above. Unless specifically required by the journal, I suggest these points are addressed as mentioned above. Regardless – as above – strengths and limitations of this study should be limited to those encountered in this particular study, not ethnographic studies in general.</p> <p>Language and style</p> <p>There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes throughout which need correction. In particular the word 'boarders' in the title should be 'borders' – in the text it is spelt both ways. An edit from an English language editor is recommended.</p>
--	--

REVIEWER	Dr.Marjorie Bonello University of Malta
REVIEW RETURNED	22-Jan-2019

GENERAL COMMENTS	This is an interesting study however could be improved if the discussion section flows more and delves deeper into possible reasons for the findings (in dialogue with the literature).
-------------------------	---

	The reviewer also provided a marked copy with additional comments. Please contact the publisher for full details.
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

1

Background

Good introduction to the topic area and helpful use of the terms 'interprofessional education (IPE)' and 'interprofessional learning (IPL)'. However many readers will not necessarily be immediately familiar with these differences, so define these terms more clearly in the introduction.

Answer : We have now clarified the differences between IPE and IPL and added Funnel (1995), please see page 7 paragraph 3.

2

The later section labelled 'Methods Discussion' currently reads like an extraction from a thesis, and would in my view be better greatly shortened and woven into this Background/Introduction section.

Answer: Thank you for this comment and we have followed the advice and introduced the ethnographic method in the Background and shortened and rephrased the Methods discussion section, see page 8 paragraph 1 and page 24 paragraph 2.

#3

Good referencing to ethnographic methods per se, and a brief description of the power of direct observation of behaviour would suffice, followed by a justification of the choice of method in the first part of the Methods section. This will make the manuscript far more succinct and readable. Methods As above, I suggest opening this main Methods section with a short subsection on the choice of this particular ethnographic method, including the 'marginal participant' technique, in relation to the research question, and a brief description of what an ethnographic approach is – its key strengths and shortfalls. For example, you write "An ethnographic study design was chosen to explore the research question in depth" – but why? Explaining this point should then lead logically into the following subsections of data collection, analysis etc.

Answer: See the answer above. However, we have also added a deeper description of the choice of method in the beginning of the Methods section please see page 8 paragraph 2 line 1-5.

#4

Some more detail about how the data were collected is needed – for example, you state that data was collected on consecutive days, but how do we know as readers that the days the researcher was 'unavailable' were days where she/he anticipated particular difficulties or specific situations?

Answer: We have now clarified the data collection section please see page 10 paragraph 3.

5 Results

This descriptive section would benefit from rewriting to both describe and initially interpret the data under the provisional headings 'learning with', 'learning from' etc. Currently some of this interpretation is in, or repeated in, the Discussion section, and would be better moved here.

Results were deliberately looked at via an IPE lens. Even so, were the observers unduly biased as to what they thought they would find at the outset?

Some of the quotes need better introduction, as the link with the preceding text is often not clear.

Answer: The result section and the discussion are now partly rewritten in line with this comment. We have, by purpose, performed the analysis based on the established framework of IPE: Learning with, from and about. Of course, this can be seen as a limitation and we have added a comment on that in the strength and limitation section please see page 24 paragraph 2. However, we see this paper as a base for future research aiming to more inductive exploration of IPL in regular care contexts.

We have now clarified the introduction of some of the quotes in the result section,

6 Tables

Table 1 is very useful and should be retained, but what I take to be Table 2 – describing different analytic Domains – is confusing without adequate caption and explanation in the text. This level of detail is probably not necessary in the main paper – but it could be available as supplementary additional material if this option is available.

Answer 6: The part that you "take as Table 2" is not a part of the manuscript but the COREQ guidelines for report on qualitatively studies, it is not supposed to be a part of the published paper.

7 Discussion

As above, the Discussion section should primarily discuss the implication of the findings for IPE and IPL more widely and in comparison to others' findings. Are there other comparable 'direct observation' studies in uni-professional learning?

The limitation discussed here should be limitations of this particular study, not the limitations of ethnography as a methodology – see comments above Serendipitous learning is a common feature of much clinical placement work – how do the findings from this study contribute to this discourse? For instance, consider this concept: IP Learning can be formal and expected and assessed in a variety of clinical contexts, not only in wards dedicated to IPE There also needs to be more explanation and discussion about the impact on the research of the widely different length of placements for medical and nursing students, as this is a common situation. Might the very short medical student placement length be key to the lack of meaningful IPL – discuss.

Answer:

The discussion section is now partly rewritten in line with this comment. We have added Liljedahl et al who has studied uniprofessional learning, please see page 23 paragraph 1.

In line with previous comments we have rephrased (Strength and limitations) and shortened the method discussion, and also related it to our study in a greater extent please see page 24 paragraph 2.

We have now added a paragraph discussing serendipitous learning please see page 22 paragraph 3.

We have now added a paragraph discussing the difference in length of placements please see page 22 paragraph 3.

8 Abstract

Design and setting – give the location of the study and the time frame for the data collection Strengths and limitations subsection As above. Unless specifically required by the journal, I suggest these

points are addressed as mentioned above. Regardless – as above – strengths and limitations of this study should be limited to those encountered in this particular study, not ethnographic studies in general.

Answer 8:

We have now added location of the study and the time frame of the data collection

Strengths and limitations. See answer above, we have now clarified this paragraph

Language and style

There are grammatical errors and spelling mistakes throughout which need correction. In particular the word 'boarders' in the title should be 'borders' – in the text it is spelt both ways. An edit from an English language editor is recommended.

Answer: We have now made some grammatical corrections in the whole manuscript. A native English-speaking colleague has also gone through the manuscript.

Reviewer: 2

Reviewer Name: Dr.Marjorie Bonello

Institution and Country: University of Malta

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

Please leave your comments for the authors below This is an interesting study however could be improved if the discussion section flows more and delves deeper into possible reasons for the findings (in dialogue with the literature). See comments in the attached file.

Answer:

General: We have now made some grammatical corrections in the whole manuscript.

Title: We have changed the title according to the editors suggestions

Abstract: We have now clarified the objectives according to your suggestions.

We have now clarified the conclusion according to your suggestions.

Strengths and limitations of this study: We have changed this paragraph according to your suggestions please see page 4.

Objectives: We have changed this part according to your suggestions please see page 5 paragraph 3 line 11.

Method: We have changed this part according to your suggestions please see page 9 paragraph 2 line 5; page 10 paragraph 1 line 2; page 12 paragraph 2 line 14; page 12 paragraph 2 line 2.

Results: The result section is now partly rewritten in line with your comments.

Discussion: The discussion section is now partly rewritten in line with your comments.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Sue Pullon University of Otago New Zealand
REVIEW RETURNED	31-Mar-2019
GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for the opportunity to see a revised version of the manuscript. The authors have done an excellent job of clarifying the points raised earlier and making the article more readable. There are still a few grammatical peculiarities to address; i assume the in house editors can easily deal with these. Otherwise this is now very suitable for publication and I have no further comments.

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Sue Pullon

Institution and Country: University of Otago New Zealand Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': none declared

1 - Please leave your comments for the authors below Thank you for the opportunity to see a revised version of the manuscript. The authors have done an excellent job of clarifying the points raised earlier and making the article more readable. There are still a few grammatical peculiarities to address; i assume the in house editors can easily deal with these. Otherwise this is now very suitable for publication and I have no further comments.

Answer: See answer to # 2 of the Editorial Requests.