



Reviewer Assessment

Maria-Christina Stefanescu, Jasmina Sterz, Sebastian Herbert Hofer and Miriam Ruessler*

Young surgeons' challenges at the start of their clinical residency: a semi-qualitative study

<https://doi.org/10.1515/iss-2018-0015>

Received April 17, 2018; accepted May 24, 2018

*Corresponding author: Prof. Dr. med. Miriam Ruessler, Department of Trauma, Hand and Reconstructive Surgery, University Hospital Frankfurt, Goethe University, Theodor Stern Kai 7, 60590 Frankfurt, Germany, Phone: 069-6301-6123, E-mail: miriam.ruessler@kgu.de

Reviewers' Comments to Original Submission

Reviewer 1: anonymous

May 09, 2018

Reviewer Recommendation Term: Accept with Minor Revision
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating: 75

Custom Review Questions	Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	4
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	4
Are the results/conclusions justified?	4
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	4
How adequate is the data presentation?	4
Are units and terminology used correctly?	4
Is the number of cases adequate?	4
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	4
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	4
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	4
Please rate the practical significance.	4
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	N/A
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	4
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	4
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	4
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	4
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

Comments to Authors:

In the current paper the authors analysed how junior doctors in their first and second years felt about their preparation for clinical practice as a doctor from their undergraduate training, as well as which teaching formats and factors influence their preparedness. A semi-qualitative interview-based study was performed using a structured interview manual. The study participants were 35 residents of general and visceral surgery, trauma surgery, and urology in their first and second years of medical specialty training. The audio recordings were transcribed word by word and analysed with structured qualitative content analysis techniques.

Only 43% of the participating residents stated they were sufficiently prepared to be a doctor from undergraduate medical training while 22.9% stated that they were not prepared. Nevertheless, 34.3% of the residents stated that undergraduate medical training did prepare them for some extent.

Administrative pathways (71%), deficits in linking knowledge to clinical reasoning (71%), decision making (54%), and therapy planning (51%) were the major hurdles the study participants described. Finally, to be better prepared for clinical practice, participants suggested providing a clearer structure of medical training as a an increasing patient encounters directly from the beginning of medical school.

In my opinion this is a very interesting topic the authors assess in their paper: the impression of junior doctors in their first and second years about their preparation for clinical practice as a doctor from their undergraduate training.

In fact the paper is well structured, written and gives a good overview of the current topic. Therefore, I have just some minor comments:

1. After completing the current study, the authors should clearly state what further research should focus in this topic.
2. A statistician should evaluate the study with respect to the statistical methods used in this study.

Reviewer 2: Carsten Krones

May 05, 2018

Reviewer Recommendation Term:

Accept with Minor Revision

Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:

99

Custom Review Questions**Response**

Is the subject area appropriate for you?	5 - High/Yes
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	5 - High/Yes
Are the results/conclusions justified?	4
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	5 - High/Yes
How adequate is the data presentation?	4
Are units and terminology used correctly?	5 - High/Yes
Is the number of cases adequate?	5 - High/Yes
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	4
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	4
Please rate the practical significance.	5 - High/Yes
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	4
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	4
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	4
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	3
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	5 - High/Yes
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	4
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

Comments to Authors:

Congratulations: hot Topic and a very good study; for sure, it must be printed;

Some additional comments:

* to work independently - as a newcomer in medicine - is a totally unreal aim, despite all improvements; please, stress shortly on this fact in your discussion; do we have to weaken this assumption?

* include your interview manual as an attachment

* If possible: add sub analyses according to age, sex, type of hospital and vocational training; are there any striking differences?

* Page 11: „what do you if a patient suffers pain?“ is this correct? Or better: what do you do...?

* you identify discontinuity as a major problem in patient care; this problem derives at least to some extent from the trend to speciality, which is forced by the health policy as well as all medical societies; stress shortly on this contradiction, which needs to be solved

* Your discussion identifies management aspects, participation in care from admission to discharge, the role model of residents and structured on-the-job adjustments as the main topics to be solved; but who stands in the duty to improve the situation? Make some proposals;

* Your proposals for improvement are expensive; who is going to pay for it?

* The discussion about the unknown role model as a physician is very important, especially in times of rising bureaucracy, specialisation and economic pressure; there are several literal attempts to counter this development, e.g. Survival Guide Chirurgie, Survival Guide Neurology, Mein erster Dienst - Anästhesie, Mein erster Dienst - psychiatrische Notfälle; mention them as good examples

* Literature: try to include:

* [“Practical clinical competence” - a joint programme to improve training in surgery].

* [Article in German]

* Ruesseler M1, Schill A1, Stibane T2, Damanakis A3, Schleicher I4, Menzler S5, Braunbeck A1, Walcher F1

* Chirurg. 2010 Jan;81(1):7-13. doi: 10.1007/s00104-009-1760-6.

* [Realistic surgical training. The Aachen model].

* [Article in German]

* Krones C]1, Binnebösel M, Stumpf M, Schumpelick V.

* Zentralbl Chir. 2012 Apr;137(2):144-8. doi: 10.1055/s-0031-1283985. Epub 2012 Apr 11.[Surgical education has its price].

* [Article in German]

* Schröder W1, Krones C].

Authors' Response to Reviewer Comments

May 16, 2018

Dear Prof. Jähne, dear reviewers,

thank you for the appreciation of our manuscript and for giving us valuable feedback to further improve its quality. Below, you will find our point-by-point reply to your comments. All changes made within the manuscript are highlighted using coloured text.

We hope that after these changes our manuscript is suitable for acceptance in the journal.

Kind regards

Reviewer #1:

In the current paper the authors analyzed how junior doctors in their first and second years felt about their preparation for clinical practice as a doctor from their undergraduate training, as well as which teaching formats and factors influence their preparedness. A semi-qualitative interview-based study was performed using a structured interview manual. The study participants were 35 residents of general and visceral surgery, trauma surgery, and urology in their first and second years of medical specialty training. The audio recordings were transcribed word by word and analyzed with structured qualitative content analysis techniques.

Only 43% of the participating residents stated they were sufficiently prepared to be a doctor from undergraduate medical training while 22.9% stated that they were not prepared. Nevertheless, 34.3% of the residents stated that undergraduate medical training did prepare them for some extent.

Administrative pathways (71%), deficits in linking knowledge to clinical reasoning (71%), decision making (54%), and therapy planning (51%) were the major hurdles the study participants described. Finally, to be better prepared for clinical practice, participants suggested providing a clearer structure of medical training as a an increasing patient encounters directly from the beginning of medical school.

In my opinion this is a very interesting topic the authors assess in their paper: the impression of junior doctors in their first and second

years about their preparation for clinical practice as a doctor from their undergraduate training.

In fact the paper is well structured, written and gives a good overview of the current topic. Therefore, I have just some minor comments:

- Thank you for highly appreciating our work.

1. After completing the current study, the authors should clearly state what further research should focus in this topic.

- Thank you for this remark, the further research needed is more clearly formulated in the discussion.

2. A statistician should evaluate the study with respect to the statistical methods used in this study.

- The whole study was supervised and analysed and evaluated by a statistician specialised in qualitative and semi-qualitative studies.

Reviewer #2:

Congratulations: hot Topic and a very good study; for sure, it must be printed;

-Thank you

Some additional comments:

* to work independently - as a newcomer in medicine - is a totally unreal aim, despite all improvements; please, stress shortly on this fact in your discussion; do we have to weaken this assumption?

- Thank you for this remark, this aspect was more stressed in the discussion.

* include your interview manual as an attachment

- Thank you for this remark, if the editor agrees, the interview manual can be provided as supplemental material.

* If possible: add sub analyses according to age, sex, type of hospital and vocational training; are there any striking differences?

- Thank you for this remark. For subgroup analysis of sex, age, type of hospital and vocational training, the study sample is too small in order to make clear statements.

* Page 11: „what do you if a patient suffers pain?“ is this correct? Or better: what do you do...?

- Thank you for this remark, this was corrected in the manuscript.

* Your discussion identifies management aspects, participation in care from admission to discharge, the role model of residents and structured on-the-job adjustments as the main topics to be solved; but who stands in the duty to improve the situation? Make some proposals;

- Thank you for this remark, this aspect was further emphasized in the discussion.

* The discussion about the unknown role model as a physician is very important, especially in times of rising bureaucracy, specialisation and economic pressure; there are several literal attempts to counter this development, e.g. Survival Guide Chirurgie, Survival Guide Neurology, Mein erster Dienst - Anästhesie, Mein erster Dienst - psychiatrische Notfälle; mention them as good examples

- Thank you for this remark. The authors do not see the existing books such as survival guides as a good example for attempts to counter this development as to our opinion this should be taught by the medical faculties and the corresponding hospitals.

* Literature: try to include:

* [“Practical clinical competence” - a joint programme to improve training in surgery].

* [Article in German]

* Ruesseler M1, Schill A1, Stibane T2, Damanakis A3, Schleicher I4, Menzler S5, Braunbeck A1, Walcher F1

* Chirug. 2010 Jan;81(1):7-13. doi: 10.1007/s00104-009-1760-6.

* [Realistic surgical training. The Aachen model].

* [Article in German]

* Krones CJ1, Binnebösel M, Stumpf M, Schumpelick V.

* Zentralbl Chir. 2012 Apr;137(2):144-8. doi: 10.1055/s-0031-1283985. Epub 2012 Apr 11.[Surgical education has its price].

* [Article in German]

* Schröder W1, Krones CJ.

- Thank you for this remark.

The authors do not see a possibility to fit the first literature proposal within the text. As this literature represents the description of the funded research project where the present study belongs to, it might be the possibility to include the literature in the author statement under research funding, if the editor agrees.

The authors rate the other two proposed references as important in the context of surgical education and training. However, to our mind, the proposed references do not fit completely in the context of our manuscript compared to the already included references which already complete the general guideline for the maximum number of references.

Comments to Revision

Reviewer 1: anonymous

May 24, 2018

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Accept
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	90
Custom Review Questions	Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	5 - High/Yes
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	4
Are the results/conclusions justified?	4
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	5 - High/Yes
How adequate is the data presentation?	4
Are units and terminology used correctly?	5 - High/Yes
Is the number of cases adequate?	4
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	N/A
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	4
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	5 - High/Yes
Please rate the practical significance.	5 - High/Yes
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	4
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	4
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	4
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	4
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	4
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	5 - High/Yes
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes
Comments to Authors:	
Accept in the current form.	

Reviewer 2: Carsten Krones

May 17, 2018

Reviewer Recommendation Term:	Accept
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:	90
Custom Review Questions	Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	4
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	4
Are the results/conclusions justified?	4
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	4
How adequate is the data presentation?	4
Are units and terminology used correctly?	4
Is the number of cases adequate?	4
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	4

Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	4
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	4
Please rate the practical significance.	4
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	4
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	4
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	4
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	4
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	4
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	4
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

Comments to Authors:

-
