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Author’s response to reviews:

Eva Annette Rehfuess
Editor
Systematic Reviews

July 12 2017

Re: SYSR-D-17-00054

Dear Dr. Rehfuess,

Thank you for providing us with additional suggestions for revision of our manuscript entitled “Psychosocial and career outcomes of peer mentorship in medical resident education: A systematic review protocol” (SYSR_D_17-00054). All comments have been addressed (see
below) and the manuscript revised accordingly. Manuscript changes have been highlighted in yellow in the text.

We hope you find these revisions acceptable and look forward to your response.

Diane Lorenzetti PhD, MLS
Dept of Community Health Sciences
University of Calgary
3rd Floor TRW Building
3280 Hospital Drive NW
Calgary, Alberta Canada T2N 4Z6
dllorenz@ucalgary.ca
1-403-210-9319

REVIEWER COMMENTS
The logic model you have drawn up is still rather simplistic; most importantly, it seems to be at least partly disconnected from the methodological approach described in the text (e.g. groups of outcomes are differently described in diagram and text). You may want to take a look at the following two publications in terms of the uses of logic modelling and elements to consider as part of your logic model and use these to refine your own logic model:


AUTHORS

Thank you for this feedback. Our logic model is broad and similar to a PICO statement. Our rationale for including a broad logic model was that, as we intend, through our review, to explore the nature of peer mentoring relationships in medical residency education, and the drivers and barriers that might impact on relationship outcomes, a broad a priori logic model would be appropriate. In light of this comment, however, we have revised the logic model to incorporate various modifiers that might impact on the quality and outcomes of these relationships. These revisions were informed by our existing knowledge of the mentoring literature in other related disciplines such as nursing. We have also revised our manuscript to align manuscript outcome descriptions more closely with those presented in our logic model.

REVIEWER COMMENTS

2. While the article by Pluye & Hong 2014 provides an excellent account of mixed method approaches and one may be able to derive synthesis methods from it, it does not specifically refer to methods of evidence synthesis, of which many already exist. I would suggest that you consult the guidance for choosing qualitative evidence synthesis methods (see http://www.integrate-hta.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Guidance-on-choosing-qualitative-evidence-synthesis-methods-for-use-in-HTA-of-complex-interventions.pdf) and try and refine your approach to evidence synthesis based on these.

AUTHORS

Although the Pluye & Hong 2014 paper does focus broadly on mixed methods approaches, these authors also present (beginning on page 36) approaches for conducting what they refer to as “systematic mixed studies reviews” which they equate with systematic reviews. Pluye and Hong note that there are various approaches to synthesis of mixed studies reviews, one of the more common of which is thematic analysis. We believe that thematic analysis is the method of
analysis that will enable us to effectively identify and transform themes in individual studies into a coherent synthesis of the literature on this topic. We have expanded on our discussion of data analysis in our manuscript and included additional references (including the one provided by the reviewer).

REVIEWER COMMENTS
Please include your definition/description of what “medical residents” are in the Background section.

AUTHORS:
Done

REVIEWER COMMENTS
Please re-word lines 232-4 to indicate that you will be updating your searches rather than your search strategy – the strategy itself should not change.

AUTHORS:
Done

REVIEWER COMMENTS
Your search terms have improved; could you please double-check that you have captured all terms used in the English-speaking world (e.g. do current terms also reflect those used in South
Africa, Australia, New Zealand etc.? Also, would terms such as “partnership” or “tandem approaches” need to be considered?

AUTHORS:

Thank you for these suggestions. Trial searches in MEDLINE using “partnership” and “tandem” terms do not suggest that the addition of these terms would retrieve any unique studies relevant to this review. We have explicitly searched for peer mentoring literature published in different countries, including South Africa, Australia, and believe that our search approach/terms are robust and will enable us to identify relevant studies on peer mentorship, irrespective of country of origin.