

# SWAR 39: Evaluating “Co-Creation through Consultation” to engage knowledge users in scoping reviews

## Objective of this SWAR

This Study Within a Review (SWAR) will evaluate the impact of a Knowledge User (KU) engagement model previously developed through a BEME (Best evidence medical education) scoping review [1]. The objectives are:

1. To examine the contribution and impact of KU engagement during two host scoping reviews.
2. To gather the insights and perspectives of KUs in order to further refine the KU engagement model.

Study area: Knowledge User Engagement in Scoping Reviews

Sample type: Researchers

Estimated funding level needed: Low

## Background

Scoping reviews in Health Professions Education (HPE) synthesize and map existing literature on a given topic, offering a broad overview of available evidence. They go beyond traditional systematic reviews, identifying knowledge gaps, guiding future research, and supporting evidence-based decision-making. A recent study of scoping reviews in HPE encouraged future review teams to clarify the often vague role of external consultation in scoping reviews, because engaged research contributes to high-impact, high-quality outcomes [2].

In HPE, co-creation involves the collaborative generation of knowledge by academics working alongside knowledge users (KUs), including domain experts, and patients and public involvement (PPI). Co-creation goes beyond mere consultation, aiming for genuine KU partnership. We distinguish between ‘consultation’, which involves gathering insights from KUs without their direct involvement in decision-making, and ‘co-creation’, which entails collaborative knowledge generation with active partnership and shared ownership between academics and KUs.

A shift from traditional consultation methods to co-creation in scoping reviews has been proposed, in the hope that this will yield richer findings and enhance dissemination and implementation [3]. However, there is also a need for transparency and frameworks to guide KU engagement. A key challenge is the lack of clarity on when and how to apply various models supporting KU engagement. Additionally, there is the necessity to align with PPI remuneration guidance for PPI KUs [4]. While co-creation is valuable, it can be time-consuming and resource-intensive, making it not always feasible. A better understanding of alternative KU engagement models would allow researchers to make more informed decisions when designing scoping reviews. This Study Within A Review (SWAR) [5] will provide evidence to help with this.

## Interventions and Comparators

Intervention 1: In this SWAR, we hope to examine the motivators, rationale and impact of KU engagement in two scoping reviews in HPE, for both the health professionals and the KUs involved. We will use a longitudinal qualitative study involving pre and post review interviews with the HPs and KUs to evaluate their perceptions of KU engagement in scoping reviews and their feedback and reflections on the specific KU engagement approach. Simultaneously, the KU user engagement approach will be documented for each host review. There is a proposed schedule of 12 KU engagement activities, and the non-academic PPI KUs from each review team will be remunerated for their involvement. The preparation and engagement activities of this approach during the reviews will be captured, and we will report the impact of the approach on the final reviews, at each step of the five-stage process [6,7].

Index Type:

**Method for Allocating to Intervention or Comparator:**

## **Outcome Measures**

Primary: Qualitative Measures: We will conduct pre- and post-review interviews with participating health professionals and KUs. These interviews will explore their perceptions of KU engagement, the effectiveness of the engagement approach, and any perceived benefits or challenges. The interviews will be analyzed using thematic analysis [8] to identify recurring themes, patterns, and variations in perspectives between health professionals and KUs. This will allow us to capture the depth and nuance of their experiences and insights into the KU engagement process.

Process-Oriented Measures: The KU engagement approach will be systematically documented for each host review. This documentation will include preparation activities, the nature and frequency of KU interactions, and the specific engagement activities undertaken during each stage of the review process. We will assess how these activities influence the review's outcomes, including the quality, relevance, and comprehensiveness of the final scoping reviews.

Secondary :

## **Analysis Plans**

Impact Analysis: The impact of KU engagement on the scoping reviews will be evaluated using a tool such as the Public Involvement Impact Assessment Framework (PiiAF) [9]. Feedback from KUs and health professionals will be analyzed to understand the broader implications of KU involvement for future scoping reviews. This dual approach will provide a comprehensive understanding of the value and challenges of KU engagement in HPE scoping reviews.

## **Possible Problems in Implementing This SWAR**

Implementing this SWAR across various reviews and with different reviewers could yield varying outcomes, making reporting a challenge. This will be overcome by describing the results of the SWAR within each review as a case study, as well as by providing an overall synthesis of findings.

## **References**

1. Doyle AJ, Sullivan C, Toole MO, Tjin A, Collins N, Murphy P, et al. Training simulated participants for role portrayal and feedback practices in communication skills training: A BEME scoping review: BEME Guide No. 86. *Medical Teacher* 2023;46(2):162–78.
2. Maggio LA, Larsen K, Thomas A, Costello JA, Artino AR. Scoping reviews in medical education: A scoping review. *Medical Education* 2021;55(6):689–700.
3. Pollock D, Alexander L, Munn Z, Peters MDJ, Khalil H, Godfrey CM, et al. Moving from consultation to co-creation with knowledge users in scoping reviews: Guidance from the JBI Scoping Review Methodology Group. *JBI Evidence Synthesis* 2022;20(4):969–79.
4. National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR). Payment guidance for members of the public considering involvement in research. 2024 pp.1–22 Available from: <https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/payment-guidance-for-members-of-the-public-considering-involvement-in-research/27372>
5. Devane D, Burke NN, Treweek S, Clarke M, Thomas J, Booth A, et al. Study within a review (SWAR). *Journal of Evidence-Based Medicine* 2022;15(4):328–32.
6. Levac D, Colquhoun H, Brien KKO. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. *Implementation Science* 2010;5:69.
7. Peters MDJ, Marnie C, Tricco AC, Pollock D, Munn Z, Alexander L, et al. Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JBI Evidence Synthesis* 2020;18(10):2119–26.
8. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 2006;3(2):77–101.
9. Popay J, Collins M (editors). The Public Involvement Impact Assessment Framework Guidance. 2014. Available from <https://piiaf.org.uk/documents/piiaf-guidance-jan14.pdf>

## **Publications or presentations of this SWAR design**

## **Examples of the implementation of this SWAR**

People to show as the source of this idea: Dr Andrea Doyle  
Contact email address: andreadoyle@rcsi.com  
Date of idea: 10/10/2024  
Revisions made by:  
Date of revisions: