SAMPLE REVIEW

This anti-coagulant TBL is a resource designed as an interprofessional activity for medical and pharmacy residents and graduate student-level psychologists. It could also be scaled down as a resource for specific use by Medical, Pharmacy, or Psychology graduate programs.

Strengths
It adequately encompasses the foundation principals of TBL, i.e., the 4 Ss. In addition, information related to the session itself appears accurate and complete, the learning objectives are clear and relevant, and TBL is an appropriate and effective method to deliver this curriculum. However, there are other requirements for publication on MedEdPORTAL that are either incomplete or not addressed.

Weaknesses
1. The content of this submission is accurate and clear, but needs a bit of refinement with respect to usability (requirement 4). In the Facilitator’s Guide, under “Teaching Points” related to RAT questions 7 & 8, the reader is referred to the psychology reading. However, it is difficult, particularly for the non-psychology facilitator, to gain a snapshot of the teaching point(s) for these two questions. As provided for the other questions, having analogous information for questions 7 & 8 explicitly stated would add value to this document as a shared resource.

2. While there may be a paucity of available resources related to inter-professional education in these particular professions, the authors have provided no indication how their submission builds on related work (requirement 5), if any. This should be addressed.

3. The authors need to satisfy requirement 6 (provide evidence of the relative value or impact of this submission for the intended audience). Towards that end, they indicate in the Abstract that “The participants completed two evaluation surveys at the end so facilitators could determine the module’s effectiveness.” This indicates that they have collected data from their learners and should be able to use this as a basis for achieving this requirement.

4. The authors need to satisfy requirement 7 (offer critically reflective comments regarding their resource). This would be a valuable addition given the inter-professional nature of this resource. Thus, it would be extremely helpful if the authors would provide a brief summary of their experiences with the implementation of this exercise. This could address, but certainly not be limited to, the following questions:
a. Can the authors provide learner feedback, for example, from graduate students who have been asked to prepare by reviewing >40 pages of “medicine and pharmacy” material, much of which may be outside of their existing foundational knowledge base?

b. How do individual learner cohorts perform on an iRAT that assesses mastery of foundational concepts that may be outside of their pre-existing knowledge base? Once again, this would seem particularly relevant to the psychology graduate student, as only 2 of the 10 RAT questions appear directed at their discipline.

Recommendation
While the content of this submission is accurate and clear, it suffers from usability challenges. The concerns listed above should be addressed by the author. Because of this I am recommending that we return this submission to the author for revisions.

Key Points:
- The review is thorough. The reviewer provided adequate narrative feedback.
- The review is thoughtful. The reviewer summarized the submission, showing an understanding of the context and value of the materials. Positive commentary is included.
- The review is critical. The reviewer identifies weaknesses and provides feedback for improvement.
- The review is specific. The reviewer refers to document names and sections where changes should occur. Recommendations are enumerated so the author can easily refer to them.
- The review is relevant. The author explains any “no” answers to the review form questions.