



Oct 10, 2024

Remote POCUS Education Protocol for Article Screening and Selection

DOI

<https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.36wgqnxdogk5/v1>

Elisa A¹, Sophia Lin¹, Tyler Wise¹

¹NYP Weill Cornell



Elisa A

NYP Weill Cornell

Create & collaborate more with a free account

Edit and publish protocols, collaborate in communities, share insights through comments, and track progress with run records.

Create free account

OPEN  ACCESS



DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.36wgqnxdogk5/v1>

Protocol Citation: Elisa A, Sophia Lin, Tyler Wise 2024. Remote POCUS Education Protocol for Article Screening and Selection. protocols.io <https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.36wgqnxdogk5/v1>

License: This is an open access protocol distributed under the terms of the **Creative Commons Attribution License**, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited

Protocol status: Working

We use this protocol and it's working

Created: October 10, 2024

Last Modified: October 10, 2024

Protocol Integer ID: 109642

Keywords: remote ultrasound education, field of remote ultrasound education, care ultrasound education, remote pocus education protocol for article screening, care ultrasound, remote pocus education protocol, medical learning, medical education, part in medical education, medical education curriculum, use of remote learning, prominent in medical education curriculum, remote learning, objective of this scoping review, pubmed medical subject heading, article screening, scoping reviews joanna briggs institute scoping review, distance learning, scoping review, search with pubmed medical subject heading, field of medicine, allowing student, patient, diagnosis, literature on remote point

Abstract

Abstract:

Background:

Since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, learning at a distance has experienced a significant rise in popularity. Distance learning is a tool frequently used in medical education. Medical learning at a distance has the potential to reshape the field of medicine by allowing students from remote and underserved locations to more easily learn to provide care. There is a need to better understand how distance learning plays a part in medical education. The use of point of care ultrasound to aid in the diagnosis and management of patients is well documented and becoming increasingly more prominent in medical education curriculums. Access to this valuable tool can be limited in remote and/or low and middle income countries. The use of remote learning may make POCUS more accessible.

Objective:

The objective of this scoping review is to examine the literature on remote point-of-care ultrasound education in lower- and middle-income countries to better understand what can be said about best practices and what outcomes are being studied. This scoping review aims to better understand the field of remote ultrasound education and identify gaps in the literature to inform future research.

Methods and analysis:

The included articles were examined following the Scoping Reviews Joanna Briggs Institute scoping review methodological framework and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA-ScR) protocol. A comprehensive search from a total of five (MEDLINE, Embase, Cochrane Library, CINAHL, Scopus) electronic databases was performed, beginning with MEDLINE to build a search with PubMed Medical Subject Heading (MeSH) terms and free terms built from synonyms of the MeSH terms. Then, the reference list of included articles was screened by 3 authors baseline on predetermined inclusion/exclusion criteria first by title/abstract then by full text. A calibration exercise was conducted with an initial batch of 10% of both title/abstracts and full text articles by all 3 authors. Two review authors independently. Articles were selected if two authors agreed. The extracted data will be qualitatively analyzed and presented in a diagrammatic or tabular form, alongside a narrative summary, in line with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis: extension for Scoping Reviews reporting guidelines.



Title/Abstract Screening

- 1 Initial Screening Plan
 - 1.1 a. TW, SL, and EA review the title AND abstract for all articles
 - Reviewing title alone is insufficient
 - If abstract is unavailable, review the full text of the article
 - 1.2 b. Remove irrelevant studies based on predetermined inclusion/exclusion criteria
- 2 Initial Calibration
 - 2.1 a. TW, SL, and EA all review title/abstract for a batch of 10% of the articles (230 articles)
 - 2.2 b. If > 90% agreement among reviewers with initial 10% of articles, then proceed with screening remainder of articles
 - 2.3 c. If $\leq 90\%$ agreement with first 10% of articles, TW, SL, EA should meet to discuss, clarify/consider modifying inclusion criteria if needed
 - 2.4 - if inclusion criteria are modified, select another 10% of articles (230 articles) for a second calibration exercise with modified inclusion criteria
- 3 Screening of Remainder of Title/Abstracts
 - 3.1 a. TW, SL, EA will each review remainder of articles (title and abstract, full-text if abstract not available)
 - 3.2 b. Articles marked as not applicable by ≥ 2 reviewers are excluded



Full Text Article Review

4 Initial Calibration

- 4.1 a.
TW, SL, and EA review full text for initial batch of 10% of articles
- 4.2 a.
If > 90% agreement among reviewers with initial 10% of articles, then proceed with full-text review of all remaining articles
- 4.3 a.
If $\leq 90\%$
agreement with first 10% of articles, TW, SL, EA should meet to discuss, clarify/consider modifying inclusion criteria if needed
- 4.4 a.
Reasons for exclusion will be documented in both Covidence and study spreadsheet
-
Articles will be included if 2 or more reviewers agree

5 Review of remainder of articles

- 5.1 a.
TW, SL, and EA review full-text articles
-
Remaining 90% of articles divided into thirds:
TW/SL review 1/3, TW/EA review 1/3, SL/EA review 1/3
- 5.2 b.
For inclusion in review, 2 or more reviewers should agree

6 Data Extraction

- 6.1 a.
Group meets to discuss and refine data



extraction form after all 3 reviewers have each reviewed 5-10 papers and entered data onto form

- 6.2 b.
Reviewers add any additional data to form from their previously reviewed articles