Peer Review Comment Guidance

During the Small Group Peer Review stage, your job is to provide a first critical eye on the content of your colleagues' items. Your role is Subject Matter Expert, and your basic responsibilities are to ensure that the item makes sense, is complete and accurate, and can be answered by PA students at the relevant stage of their education. But what happens after you've reviewed the Peer Review Checklist and found errors or areas for improvement?

Our preference – and the author's – is for the small group scribe to directly edit the item; changes are tracked, so the original will still be available if needed in the History tab. If the item requires more specific expertise, or if the small group cannot make sense of what the author was trying to assess with the item – the small group scribe should provide clear and specific comments so that your colleague understands what the small group would like them to change. Remember: the author thought the item was in good shape when they submitted it. It is up to the small group to point out why it disagrees.

- ❑ Item
    - o If the item doesn't make sense, tell them why. And be specific about what is creating confusion.
    - o Ask probing questions to help them clarify their thinking.
    - o If you think the substance is incorrect, tell them what is wrong.
    - o If medications are outdated, suggest an alternative.
    - o Mark enemies if one of the questions would clue examinees to the correct answer of another question.
- ❑ Stem
    - o Provide guidance on what would improve the scenario and its ability to test the examinee's clinical reasoning.
    - o Identify any lab values that may not be in an appropriate range (too high, too low, borderline) or absent
- ❑ Image/Asset (if applicable)
    - o Make a note if the image does not correspond to the question
    - o Make a note if you see identifying information in the image itself
    - o Suggest an alternative, if necessary
- ❑ Options
    - o If there is a problem with any of the options (more than one correct, any not plausible, they are all different interventions/tests/diseases), identify what is wrong and suggest alternatives.
- ❑ Metadata
    - o Rather than change the metadata, provide potential corrections to the item.
    - o If an item is coded to the wrong task area, would it be easier to fix the question or the code? Keep in mind that the task areas are assigned for a reason – if you can change the question relatively easily, do so.