The effectiveness of the Peyton's 4-step teaching approach on skill acquisition of procedures in health professions education: A systematic review and meta-analysis with integrated meta-regression

Katia Giacomino [Equal first author, 1], **Rahel Caliesch** [1], **Karl Martin Sattelmayer** [Corresp. Equal first author, 1]

[1] School of Health Sciences, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Western Switzerland Valais (HES-SO Valais-Wallis), Leukerbad, Valais, Switzerland

Corresponding Author: Karl Martin Sattelmayer
Email address: martin.sattelmayer@hevs.ch

Background. Acquisition of procedures is an important element in health professions education. Traditionally procedures are taught using a "see one - do one" approach. That is a teacher demonstrates and describes a procedure and afterwards the students practice the procedure. A more recent teaching approach for the acquisition of procedural skills was presented by Walker and Peyton. Peyton's teaching approach is a stepwise teaching approach and consists of the following four steps: demonstration, deconstruction, comprehension and performance. The aims of this study were i) to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of Peyton's 4-step teaching approach on the acquisition of procedural skills in health professions education and ii) to evaluate whether studies with fewer students per teacher showed a larger between group difference than studies with more students per teacher.

Methods. We searched in Medline, PsycInfo, Embase and ERIC for eligible studies. Records were screened by two independent reviewers. A random effects meta-analysis was performed to evaluate skill acquisition and time needed to perform the procedures at post-acquisition and retention tests. A meta-regression was used to explore the effect of the number of students per teacher on the estimated effect of the educational interventions.

Results. An effect size of 0.45 SMD (95%Ci: 0.15; 0.75) at post-acquisition and 0.7 SMD (95%Ci: -0.09; 1.49) at retention testing were in favour of Peyton's teaching approach. The effectiveness of Peyton's teaching approach was less clear in subgroup analyses using peer teachers. Meta-regression showed that the number students per teacher was an important moderator variable.

Conclusion. Peyton's teaching approach is an effective teaching approach for skill acquisition of procedural skills in health professions education. When peer students or student tutors are used as teachers the effectiveness of Peyton's teaching approach is less clear. Peyton's teaching approach is more effective when small groups with few students per teacher are used.

The effectiveness of the Peyton's 4-step teaching approach on skill acquisition of procedures in health professions education: a systematic review and meta-analysis with integrated meta-regression

Katia Giacomino[1], Rahel Caliesch[1], Karl Martin Sattelmayer[1]

[1] School of Health Sciences, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Western Switzerland Valais (HES-SO Valais-Wallis), Leukerbad, Switzerland

Corresponding Author:

Karl Martin Sattelmayer
Rathausstr. 8, Leukerbad, Valais, 3954, Switzerland
Email address: martin.sattelmayer@hevs.ch

Abstract

Background. Acquisition of procedures is an important element in health professions education. Traditionally procedures are taught using a “see one - do one” approach. That is a teacher demonstrates and describes a procedure and afterwards the students practice the procedure. A more recent teaching approach for the acquisition of procedural skills was presented by Walker and Peyton. Peyton's teaching approach is a stepwise teaching approach and consists of the following four steps: demonstration, deconstruction, comprehension and performance. The aims of this study were i) to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of Peyton’s 4-step teaching approach on the acquisition of procedural skills in health professions education and ii) to evaluate whether studies with fewer students per teacher showed a larger between group difference than studies with more students per teacher.

Methods. We searched in Medline, PsycInfo, Embase and ERIC for eligible studies. Records were screened by two independent reviewers. A random effects meta-analysis was performed to evaluate skill acquisition and time needed to perform the procedures at post-acquisition and retention tests. A meta-regression was used to explore the effect of the number of students per teacher on the estimated effect of the educational interventions.

Results. An effect size of 0.45 SMD (95%Ci: 0.15; 0.75) at post-acquisition and 0.7 SMD (95%Ci: -0.09; 1.49) at retention testing were in favour of Peyton’s teaching approach. The effectiveness of Peyton’s teaching approach was less clear in subgroup analyses using peer teachers. Meta-regression showed that the number students per teacher was an important moderator variable.

Conclusion. Peyton’s teaching approach is an effective teaching approach for skill acquisition of procedural skills in health professions education. When peer students or student tutors are used as teachers the effectiveness of Peyton’s teaching approach is less clear. Peyton's teaching approach is more effective when small groups with few students per teacher are used.

Introduction

Acquisition of procedures is an important element in health professions education (Grantcharov & Reznick 2008). Historically, the study of the acquisition of procedural skills was primarily in the field of medical and especially surgical education. However, other health professions such as nursing and physiotherapy education have developed assessment and teaching approaches for these skills as well (Oermann et al. 2016; Sattelmayer et al. 2017). Defining procedural skills is challenging. Michels et al. (2012) reported that there is considerable overlap between the terms clinical skills, psychmotor skills and procedural skills. For this report we used the following definition: Procedural skills relate to the acquisition of an adequate skill set, that allow the safe application of clinical procedures to patients".

Traditionally procedures are taught using a "see one - do one" approach. That is a teacher demonstrates and describes a procedure and afterwards the students practice the procedure. This is referred to as Halsted's teaching approach. Based on the surgeon William Steward Halsted (1904). The approach was used as an element to redesign surgical education and create a new system for training young surgeons (Cameron 1997). Although the "see one - do one" approach is often used in the training of health professionals, there is criticism of this approach. First, the approach has been used for decades and does not adhere to recent principles of adult learning such as active learner involvement (McLeod et al. 2001). Furthermore, it was reported that patient safety might be at risk because complex procedures cannot be acquired after a single observation and practice trial (Kotsis & Chung 2013). Given the diversity of existing procedures today, others argue that the teaching approach should be modified to "see many, learn from the result and do many" (Rohrich 2006).

A more recent teaching approach for the acquisition of procedural skills was presented by Walker and Peyton (1998). Peyton's teaching approach is a stepwise teaching approach and consists of the following four steps: i) step 1 refers to the demonstration of the whole procedure in real time ("demonstration"); ii) in step 2 the teacher repeats the demonstration but this time all procedural sub-steps are described ("deconstruction"); iii) during step 3 the student talks the teacher through the procedure. The teacher performs the procedure under the guidance of the student ("comprehension") and iv) in step 4 the students carry out the procedure on their own initiative ("performance").

Especially the third step seems to be important and was assumed to be beneficial for skill acquisition. The process of guiding the teacher through the procedure requires the student to remember and think about the first two steps before giving the teacher the necessary information (Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2016). This process could help students to organise their thoughts and support student-centred learning (Lom 2012). Similarly, Balafoutas and colleagues (2019) argue that students need to manipulate the information stored in their working memory based on the information provided in the first two steps. This could support the transfer of relevant information into the long-term memory. Other authors have argued that recognising the effects of the instructions on the performance could be a valuable source of feedback and might improve metacognitive skills (Herrmann-Werner et al. 2013). In addition, Rossettini et al. (2017)

mentioned that Peyton's third step involves elements of mental practice. That is, the students have the possibility to develop a mental representation of the movement in absence of an active movement. There exists evidence that mental practice is effective for skill acquisition of procedures in health professions education (Sattelmayer et al. 2016).

However, one could assume that the step-by-step approach would require considerably more time for teaching. The traditional teaching approach consist typically of two steps (demonstration and practice). The additional two steps might be assumed to be time-consuming. However, in contrast to this several authors have reported that not more time was required using Peyton's approach (Krautter et al. 2011; Rossettini et al. 2017).

Several randomised controlled trials have evaluated the effectiveness of Peyton's teaching approach. The results of these studies are not always consistent. Some trials have reported findings in favour of Peyton's approach (e.g. Balafoutas et al. 2019; Rossettini et al. 2017). Rossettini et al. (2017) showed that acquisition of a cervical mobilisation technique was considerable higher in the Peyton group compared to a standard teaching group. In contrast, Orde et al. (2010) have reported that Peyton's teaching approach showed only minor differences on skill acquisition regarding insertion of a laryngeal mask airway at post-acquisition and retention testing compared to a traditional teaching approach.

Originally Peyton's teaching approach was designed for a student-teacher ratio of 1:1 (Nikendei et al. 2014). However, such a ratio is difficult to achieve in educational institutions. Therefore, from a pragmatic point of view it is important to evaluate whether Peytons's teaching approach can be used with more students per teacher.

These inconsistencies should be further investigated through a systematic review. Therefore, the aims of this study were i) to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of Peyton's 4 step teaching approach on the acquisition of procedural skills in health professions education and ii) to evaluate whether studies with fewer students per teacher (i.e. the student-teacher ratio) showed a larger between group difference than studies with more students per teacher.

Materials & Methods

A protocol of this systematic review was registered in the OSF registries: https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/5UE7C. To improve clarity of reporting the PRISMA statement was followed (Moher et al. 2011).

Searches

We searched the following electronic databases for eligible studies: Medline, PsycInfo, Embase and ERIC. No restrictions regarding recency or publication language were set. The search strategy was build using two blocks. The first block consisted of terms relevant for the identification of the population (i.e. students in health professions education). We searched for keywords and mapped the keywords to relevant subject headings. The second block was designed to identify studies using Peyton's teaching approach. Both search blocks were

combined using the Boolean operator “and”. The search strategy is reported in Appendix 1. In addition, references of included studies were checked for potential eligible studies.

Selection criteria

The following selection criteria were applied.

Types of studies to be included

Randomised controlled trials were included. If sufficient data was available cross-over studies were eligible as well.

Participants

Only studies reporting on students in health professions education were included. Health professions education was used as an umbrella term for medical and allied health profession education (e.g. physiotherapy or nursing education). We included studies reporting on undergraduate and postgraduate students.

Interventions

Studies needed to investigate Peyton’s four-step approach for inclusion in at least one study arm (i.e. all 4 steps were used together).

Comparator

Studies needed to have a comparator group. The comparator could be a specific educational intervention (e.g. team-based education or peer teaching), educational practice as usual (e.g. a “see one - do one”) or a sham intervention.

Outcomes

The primary outcome for this review was the evaluation of procedural skills. These could be evaluated using a performance metric such as a procedure specific checklist or a global rating scale. To be included studies had to report on this outcome. The secondary outcome was the time needed to perform the procedure. If multiple procedures were trained one procedure was selected for inclusion in order to avoid a unit of analysis issue (i.e. in order to avoid including the same participants twice within a single analysis). Means and standard deviations of continuous outcomes were extracted. If standard deviations were not reported we imputed standard deviations based on standard errors or confidence intervals as suggested in the Cochrane Handbook (Higgins et al. 2019).

Study selection and data extraction

Records were screened by two independent reviewers (RC and KMS). The screening procedure was performed using the Rayyan software (Ouzzani et al. 2016). Disagreements were solved by

discussion between RC and KMS. If a referee was needed KG was consulted. One reviewer (KMS) extracted relevant data into an electronic database and a second reviewer (KG) controlled the data.

Risk of bias assessment

The risk of bias was evaluated using the Cochrane risk of bias tool (Higgins et al. 2011). A human reviewer (KMS) evaluated all included studies with respect to these items: sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of a) participants and personnel and b) outcome assessors, incomplete outcome data and selective reporting. Evaluations were compared against a machine learning classification of the risk of bias with the application "RobotReviewer" (Marshall et al. 2015). Disagreements were solved by discussion with a third person.

Strategy for data synthesis

The primary endpoint for evaluating the effectiveness of the comparisons was at the end of the intervention. A secondary analysis was performed using data from the longest available follow up endpoint.

Data analysis

The analysis was performed using the statistical software package R (R Core Team 2019). A meta-analysis of pairwise comparisons was performed using the meta package (Schwarzer 2007). A random effects model was used for the analysis and effectiveness was reported using standardized effect sizes (hedges' g) and corresponding 95% confidence intervals. The Hartung, Knapp, Sidik, Jonkmann adjustment was applied to achieve robust estimations of the treatment effect (IntHout et al. 2014). Effect sizes were interpreted following Cohen (1992). This means that an effect size of 0.2 was considered as small, 0.5 as medium and 0.8 as large. Statistical heterogeneity was assessed with I^2 statistics using the guidelines presented in the Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions (Higgins & Green 2011). The following categories were applied: 0-40% might not be important, 30-60% moderate heterogeneity, 50-90% substantial heterogeneity and 75-100% considerable heterogeneity.
A mixed effects meta-regression was performed using the meta package (Schwarzer 2007). We explored the effect of the students per teacher on the estimated effect of the educational interventions. A mixed effects meta-regression was performed using the meta package (Schwarzer 2007). The number students per teacher during the procedural skills training was used as moderator variable.

Results

Findings of the search

The electronic search on the databases Medline, PsycInfo, Embase and ERIC identified 482 potential eligible records. In addition, the screening of the abstracts identified 5 further records. After removing 45 duplicates, 442 titles and abstracts were screened. In this phase of the selection process 405 records were excluded. The full-texts of the remaining 37 records were assessed for eligibility and 23 records were excluded with the following reasons: 12 records reported an intervention, which was not eligible for inclusion (Bode et al. 2012; Bube et al. 2017; Craven et al. 2018; Custers et al. 1999; Handley & Handley 1998; Hill et al. 2010; Holmes et al. 1998; Krautter et al. 2015; Liu & Hunt 2017; Velmahos et al. 2004; Wirth et al. 2018; Yoganathan et al. 2018); 8 records used a study design, which was not eligible for inclusion (Easton et al. 2012; Mishra & Dornan 2003; Nikendei et al. 2014; Schroder et al. 2017; Skrzypek et al. 2018; Smith et al. 2019; Sopka et al. 2012; Tommaso 2016); 2 records were excluded because of missing data (Archer et al. 2015; Seymour-Walsh et al. 2015) and 1 record did not use the specified primary outcome assessment for procedural skills (Greif et al. 2010). Finally, 14 studies were included into this systematic review. An overview of the selection process is presented in Fig.1.

Figure 1. Prisma flow diagram

Included studies

The 14 included studies in this review were all randomised controlled studies. An overview of included studies and study characteristics is presented Table 1. Most of the included studies were conducted in Germany (n=10). Four studies with 3 or 4 study arms were included (Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2018; Herrmann-Werner et al. 2013; Münster et al. 2016; Ruesseler et al. 2019). In these cases, study arms investigating Peyton's teaching approach or a standard teaching approach were included. Study arms using an intervention not eligible for inclusion were excluded from this review. For example, Gradl-Dietsch et al. (2018) reported 4 study arms. The study arms peer teaching and peer teaching using Peyton's teaching approach were included. Not included were the study arms team-based learning and video-based learning. All used study arms are presented in Table 1. The included participants in most studies were within medical education. A range from first year medical students to residents in obstetrics and gynaecology was identified. Two studies used participants from nursing education (Lapucci et al. 2018; Orde et al. 2010) and one study was conducted with participants from physiotherapy education (Rossettini et al. 2017). A broad range of trained procedures has been identified. For example, basic surgical skills (Ruesseler et al. 2019), spine mobilisations (Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2016; Rossettini et al. 2017), musculoskeletal ultrasound (Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2019) or cardiopulmonary resuscitation (Jenko et al. 2012) were used as procedures. Several modified versions of Peyton's teaching approaches were used in the experimental groups. All studies with exception of five studies (Gradl-Dietsch

et al. 2019; Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2018; Herrmann-Werner et al. 2013; Münster et al. 2016; Ruesseler et al. 2019) used a standard version of Peytons's teaching approach.
The study of Herrmann-Werner et al. (2013) used a best practice skills laboratory, which consisted of structured individual feedback, performance on manikins and Peyton's teaching approach supervised by student tutors. Three studies (Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2019; Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2018; Münster et al. 2016) used peer or student teachers for the teaching events and Ruesseler et al. (2019) used a video 4-step approach.
The teaching approach in the control groups was described as traditional Halsted teaching (Balafoutas et al. 2019; Romero et al. 2018), peer teaching or student tutors teaching (Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2019; Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2018; Herrmann-Werner et al. 2013; Münster et al. 2016), 2-stage teaching approach (Jenko et al. 2012), Orde's 2-step method (Lapucci et al. 2018; Orde et al. 2010), standard instructions (Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2016; Krautter et al. 2011), traditional bedside teaching (Lund et al. 2012) or see one, do one (Rossettini et al. 2017; Ruesseler et al. 2019).
Data to evaluate the following comparisons were available:

- Peyton's teaching approach versus a standard teaching approach (PEY vs ST)
- Peyton's teaching approach with peer teaching versus a standard teaching approach with peer teaching (PeerPey vs PeerSt)
- Best practice skills lab with peer teaching versus a standard teaching approach with peer teaching (PeerBpsl vs PeerSt)
- Media supported Peyton's teaching approach versus a standard teaching approach (MPey-St)
- All forms of Peyton's teaching approach versus a standard teaching approach

Table 1. Characteristics of included studies

*if multiple procedures or assessments were used in the primary studies the included procedures and assessments within this systematics review are underlined.

Analysis of effectiveness

Below the analysis of effectiveness is presented reporting on two outcomes (i.e. performance and time needed to perform the procedure) at two different endpoints (i.e. after acquisition and after a retention period).

Performance - post-acquisition test

Fourteen studies reporting on 17 samples with a total of 970 participants allocated to Peyton's teaching approach and 935 allocated to a standard teaching approach were included for the analysis of the outcome performance at post-acquisition testing. Four different sub-groups were identified. First, 9 studies compared Peyton's teaching approach against a standard teaching approach (Balafoutas et al. 2019; Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2016; Jenko et al. 2012; Krautter et al.

2011; Lapucci et al. 2018; Lund et al. 2012; Orde et al. 2010; Romero et al. 2018; Rossettini et al. 2017). The analysis showed an effect size of 0.5 SMD (95%CI 0.13 to 0.87) in favour of the Peyton group. Heterogeneity was substantial with an I^2 of 69%. Three studies compared peer or student tutor Peyton's teaching versus peer standard teaching (Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2019; Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2018; Münster et al. 2016). The effect size was in favour of peer standard teaching with a SMD of -0.15 (95%CI between -0.23 and - 0.06). Heterogeneity was not important within this comparison (I^2: 0%). One study reported on the comparison best practice skills lab (Peyton's teaching approach was part of the intervention) with peer tutors versus standard peer teaching (Herrmann-Werner et al. 2013). A large effect in favour of best practice skills lab training was identified (SMD: 1.38; 95%CI between -0.56 and 3.32). The I^2 was 0% for this analysis. The last subgroup compared a media supported Peyton's teaching approach versus standard teaching (Ruesseler et al. 2019). A small effect was analysed in favour of the Peyton group with a SMD of 0.24 and a 95%CI between -0.22 and 0.71. The overall model showed a small to moderate effect size in favour of Peyton's teaching approach with an effect size of 0.45 SMD (95%CI between 0.15 and 0.75). Heterogeneity was substantial with an I^2 value of 82%. A predication interval between -0.6 and 1.5 was analysed (Fig. 2).

Figure 2. Forest plot performance - Peyton's 4 step versus standard teaching at post-acquisition testing; Pey: Peyton's teaching; St: standard teaching; PeerPey: peer Peyton's teaching; PeerSt: peer standard teaching; PeerBpsl: peer best practice skills lab; MPey: Media supported Peyton
NB. Gradl-Dietsch et al. (2018) and Gradl-Dietsch et al. (2016) are presented as two samples because data for women and men are analysed separately (a: woman, b: men). Data from Herrmann-Werner et al. (2013) are presented as two samples (a: participants with a 3 months follow up, b: participants with a 6 months follow up)

Performance - retention test

Five studies were included for the outcome performance at retention testing. The studies reported a total of 169 participants in the Peyton group and 135 in the standard teaching group (Fig. 3). It was possible to analyse three different subgroups. First, three studies reported on the comparison Peyton versus standard teaching (Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2016; Orde et al. 2010; Rossettini et al. 2017). A small to moderate effect in favour of the Peyton group was identified (SMD: 0.38; with a 95%CI between -0.14 and 0.9). Moderate heterogeneity was analysed (I2: 52%). The second subgroup compared peer best practice skills lab teaching with standard peer teaching (Herrmann-Werner et al. 2013). A large effect size was analysed in favour of best practice skills lab training SMD: 2.54 (95%CI between 1.75 and 3.33). The third subgroup compared Peyton's peer teaching with standard peer teaching. An SMD of -0.11 with a 95% CI between -0.51 and 0.3 in favour of peer stand teaching was analysed.
The random effects model over all subgroups showed a moderate to large effect size in favour of Peyton's teaching approach at retention testing (SMD: 0.7 with a 95%CI between -0.09 and

1.49). The heterogeneity of this analysis was large (I^2: 90%). The retention period ranged between 1 month (Rossettini et al. 2017) and 6 months (Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2016).

Figure 3. Forest plot performance - Peyton's 4 step versus standard teaching at retention testing; Pey: Peyton's teaching; St: standard teaching; PeerBpsl: peer best practice skills lab; PeerSt: peer standard teaching; PeerPey: peer Peyton's teaching

Time needed for procedure - post-acquisition test

Six studies with a total of 657 participants in the Peyton group and 655 in the standard teaching group were included in this analysis (Fig. 4). Two different subgroups were identified. One study compared peer Peyton's teaching versus peer standard teaching (Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2019). An effect size of 0.05 SMD (95% CI between -0.07 and 0.18) was analysed. The second subgroup compared Peyton's teaching approach with standard teaching. Five studies were included in this analysis (Krautter et al. 2011; Lund et al. 2012; Orde et al. 2010; Romero et al. 2018; Rossettini et al. 2017). Findings were in favour of Peyton's teaching approach with a large effect size of -1.06 SMD and a 95 % CI between -2.77 and 0.65. The overall model showed that participants in the Peyton groups needed considerably less time to perform the procedures at post-acquisition testing. A large effect size of -0.8 SMD (95%CI between -2.13 and 0.53) was associated with this finding. The heterogeneity for this analysis was large with an I^2 of 92%. The prediction interval was between -3.21 and 1.62.

Figure 4. Forest plot time needed for procedure - Peyton's 4 step versus standard teaching at post-acquisition testing; PeerPey: peer Peyton's teaching; PeerSt: peer standard teaching; Pey: Peyton's teaching; St: standard teaching

Time needed for procedure - retention test

For the analysis time needed for the procedure at retention testing two studies were included (Orde et al. 2010; Rossettini et al. 2017). Both studies compared Peyton's 4 step teaching approach with a standard teaching approach. A large effect size of -2.65 SMD (95% CI: -7.77 to 2.47) showed that the time needed to perform the procedure was considerable shorter after a training using Peyton's teaching approach. Heterogeneity was large (I2: 98%). The retention period ranged between 1 month (Rossettini et al. 2017) and 2 months (Orde et al. 2010).

Meta-regression student teacher-ratio - performance post-acquisition

A univariable meta-regression was performed to analyse whether the student-teacher ratio was an independent predictor of performance on post-acquisition tests. All studies from the meta-analysis "performance - post-acquisition test" with exception of the study of Ordre et al. (2010) (i.e. the authors did not report the student-teacher ratio) were included into the meta-regression. The metaregression showed that the effectiveness of Peyton's teaching approach was higher in studies with fewer of students per teacher (Fig. 5). The overall model explained 58% of the

variability of the effect sizes (p: 0.01, r2: 56.86%) and the students per teacher variable showed that for one student more per teacher, the effect size was reduced by 0.08. This association was statistically significant (b1: -0.08 (95% CI: -0.14 to -0.0232), t: -2.96, p: 0.01).

Figure 5. Scatterplot metaregression students per teacher as predictor for performance at post-acquisition testing

Risk of Bias

The risk of bias was low for all studies regarding the item random sequence generation with exception of the study of Ruesseler and colleagues (2019), which was classified as unclear. Regarding the allocation concealment most studies were rated as unclear with exception of two studies (Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2019; Jenko et al. 2012). Blinding of participants and personnel was rated as high in all studies with exception of the study of (Rossettini et al. 2017). The authors explicitly stated that the teachers were not aware of the teaching approach used. The risk of bias regarding outcome assessment was low. Only two studies were rated as unclear regarding this risk of bias item blinding of outcome assessment (Lapucci et al. 2018; Münster et al. 2016). One study was assessed as having a high risk of bias regarding incomplete outcome assessment because a relatively high number of study discontinuations were reported (Münster et al. 2016). A summary risk of bias plot is presented in Fig. 6.

Figure 6. Summary risk of bias plot

Sensitivity analyses

Findings from a crossover study of Gradl-Dietsch and co-workers (2019) were integrated into the meta-analysis and the study was treated as parallel group trial. In order to address a potential unit of analysis issue a sensitivity analysis was performed. Because data from paired analyses were not available we adjusted the study data based on a method described by Elbourne et al. (2002). A correlation coefficient derived from the data of Lund et al. (2012) was used to calculate an adjusted standard error.

For the meta-analysis performance at post-acquisition, the standard error of the study decreased from 0.06 to 0.04. The effect estimate of the analysis peer Peyton versus peer standard teaching remained -0.15 SMD with a slightly changed 95% CI between -0.22 to -0.08.

The adjusted standard error had only minimal influence on the meta-regression of the student teacher ratio at post-acquisition. The overall model (p: 0.01, r2: 57.54%) and the students per teacher variable (b1: -0.08 (95% CI: --0.14 to -0.0232), t: -2.96, p: 0.01) remained significantly related to the mean effect size.

Within the meta-analysis time needed for the procedure at post-acquisition testing the sensitivity analysis resulted in a slightly smaller standard error of the Gradl-Dietsch et al. (2019) study. Therefore, the effect estimate of the comparison peer Peyton’s teaching versus peer standard

teaching changed to 0.05 SMD with a 95% CI between -0.05 and 0.16. The effect estimate of the overall model did not change.

Discussion

This systematic review with meta-analysis and integrated meta-regression set out to evaluate the effectiveness of Peyton's teaching approach compared with a standard teaching approach. The primary finding was that Peyton's teaching approach was more effective than a standard teaching approach on the acquisition of procedural skills at post-acquisition testing. A small to moderate effect size was associated with this finding. However, different subgroups of Peytons's teaching approach were analysed and effectiveness differed between subgroups. Two comparisons showed findings in favour of Peyton's teaching approach when the procedure was instructed by teachers or faculty members (i.e. Peyton versus standard teaching and media supported Peyton's teaching approach versus a standard teaching approach). Two comparisons used peers to perform the procedural skills training. Peer Peyton versus peer standard teaching showed inconclusive results with a small effect size in favour of peer standard teaching. In contrast the comparison peer best practice skills lab versus peer standard teaching showed a large effect size in favour of peer best practice skills lab. Therefore, it remains unclear whether Peyton's teaching approach is effective when peers are used as tutors for the outcome skill acquisition.

The meta-analysis of skill acquisition at retention testing was in favour of Peyton's teaching approach with a moderate to large effect size. Both subgroups were in favour of Peyton's approach. However, the effect size for the experimental group was considerable smaller compared to the findings at post-acquisition testing. The comparison peer best practice skills lab versus peer standard teaching showed a large effect size. Considerable larger than the effect size at post-acquisition testing. However, only one study reported on this comparison and more studies are needed to confirm this finding.

Regarding the outcome time needed to perform the procedure the findings indicated that participants needed considerably less time to perform a procedure if Peyton's teaching approach was instructed by teachers or faculty members. One study showed a very large effect (Rossettini et al. 2017). This study showed some educational differences to the other studies in the analysis. For example, participants from physiotherapy education were used and the trained procedure was a cervical spine mobilisation. In addition, relatively few students per teacher participated in the teaching events. The potential influence of the different procedures on the effect estimate should be investigated in future studies.

The meta-regression with the student-teacher ratio as independent predictor showed that Peyton's teaching approach was more effective in groups with fewer students per teacher. This supports the idea that Peyton's teaching approach was designed for a teaching ratio of 1:1 (Nikendei et al. 2014). The student-teacher ratio of the analysed studies ranged between 13:1 (Münster et al. 2016) and several studies using a 1:1 ratio (Balafoutas et al. 2019; Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2016; Krautter et al. 2011; Romero et al. 2018). In studies where 9 or more students per teacher were used the treatment effect was close to zero. The highest effect sizes were analysed

in studies using a student teacher ratio of 3:1 (Herrmann-Werner et al. 2013; Rossettini et al. 2017). This indicates that Peyton's teaching approach should ideally be used in groups with 1 to 3 students per teacher. If this is not possible, it could be argued that group sizes with less than 9 students per teacher are still in favour of Peyton's teaching approach.

Furthermore, it should be reported that Münster et al. (2016) reported a median group size of 13 students with a range between 9 and 13 participants and Ruesseler et al. (2019) reported a maximum group size of 6 participants per teacher. These summary estimates of the variable were used within the meta-regression, but this might have caused some imprecision. In addition, the variable student-teacher ratio was not reported in the study of Orde et al. (2010) and therefore the study was not included into the meta-regression.

The control intervention in this review was labelled as "standard teaching" approach. However, the educational approaches used within the control arms presented a source of heterogeneity. A broad range of approaches was identified such as: Halsted teaching, 2-stage teaching approach, Orde's 2-step method, standard instructions, traditional bedside teaching or see one - do one. These educational approaches show considerable similarities but are not exactly the same interventions. However, all of the standard teaching approaches have in common that they did not include the third step of Peyton's teaching approach (i.e. guiding the teacher through the procedure), which is assumed to be beneficial for skill acquisition (Gradl-Dietsch et al. 2016; Rossettini et al. 2017). To deal with these differences several subgroup analyses were performed. In addition, the meta-analysis was performed using a random effects model. Within the subgroups the statistical heterogeneity was considerable smaller compared to the overall analyses. The overall analyses showed substantial heterogeneity and should therefore be analysed with caution.

Eligible outcome assessments for this systematic review were assessments of procedural skills, which could be a procedure specific checklist or a global rating scale. However, when studies reported both types of assessments, the checklists were preferred. This was justified on the basis of the suggested best methods for evaluation by the ACGME (ACGME 2000; Swing 2002). Within the guideline, checklists are recommended as "most desirable" when assessing medical procedures. Rating scales are recommended as "potentially applicable method". Therefore, we preferred data based on procedure specific checklists. However, this is a controversial topic and some authors have reported that global rating scales have additional values and should be used when procedural skills are evaluated (Ma et al. 2012; Regehr et al. 1998).

Limitations

Several other potential effect modifiers exist, which were not explored in this study because we did not specify these analyses in the study protocol. First, Gradl-Dietsch et al. (2016) reported that gender might be considered as potential moderator variable for the effectiveness of Peyton's teaching approach. Within their study the authors suggested that men might benefit more from Peyton's teaching approach compared to women. This could be explained by the results of Ali et al. (2015). The authors reported in a systematic review that the acquisition of surgical skills

differs between men and women. However, it is difficult to investigate the gender variable with a meta-regression because relatively few studies reported the findings for men and women separately.
Second, acquiring simple procedures is different from acquiring complex skills (Wulf & Shea 2002). Therefore, the complexity of the procedural skills might affect the effectiveness of Peyton's teaching approach. However, rating the complexity of the included procedures is challenging as procedures from various domains of health professions education were included.
Third, the experience of the teacher teaching the procedural skill and the experience of the students learning the skill might affect the effectiveness of Peyton's teaching approach.
Findings from a crossover trial of Gradl-Dietsch and co-workers (2019) were integrated into the meta-analysis. Findings from a paired analysis were not available and therefore we used the reported values and treated the study as a parallel group trial.
However, when the results of randomised controlled trials and crossover studies are combined, the results of crossover studies should be based on paired analyses (Elbourne et al. 2002). If findings from unpaired analyses are used the confidence intervals are likely too wide and this might give rise to a unit of analysis issue (Higgins et al. 2019). As a consequence, we performed a sensitivity analysis and adjusted the standard errors using a method described by Elbourne et al. (2002). A correlation coefficient derived from the data of Lund et al. (2012) was used to calculate the adjusted standard errors. Unfortunately, it was only possible to calculate the correlation coefficient using the Lund et al. study. The remaining studies did not provide sufficient data. However, findings remained similar after the sensitivity analysis. The only differences were slightly changed 95% confidence intervals. We have therefore decided to include the study by Gradl-Dietsch et al. (2019) in the analysis

Implications for research

Several implications for research were identified. First, the effectiveness of Peyton's teaching approach on skill acquisition should be explored in various health professions. The included studies reported on the use of Peyton's teaching approach in medical education. Only three studies were found analysing this approach in other health professions. Further studies are therefore needed to investigate this approach in the field of nursing or physiotherapy. Second, the proposed moderator variables gender, skill complexity and level of experience of teacher and students should be further explored. Third, more evidence is needed regarding the use of peer teachers. Finally, the high effectiveness of the best practice skills lab training should be explored in further studies.

Implications for practice

Peyton's teaching approach is effective for the acquisition of procedural skills. The evidence is robust for the field of medical education. One might assume that the acquisition of skills in other health professions could also benefit from Peyton's teaching approach. However, this must be further investigated. When Peyton's teaching approach is used the number of students per

teacher should be small (e.g. ranging between 1 and 3 students per teacher) to be more effective than a standard teaching approach.

Conclusions

Peyton's teaching approach is an effective teaching approach for skill acquisition of procedural skills when faculty members are used as teachers. When peer students or student tutors are used as teachers the effectiveness of Peyton's teaching approach is less clear. Peyton's teaching approach is more effective when small groups with few students per teacher are used.

List of abbreviations

MPey: Media supported Peyton
PeerBpsl: peer best practice skills lab
PeerPey: peer Peyton's teaching
PeerSt: peer standard teaching
Pey: Peyton's teaching
St: standard teaching

Acknowledgements

N.a.

References

ACGME. 2000. Suggested best methods for evaluation. *ACGME/ABMS Joint Initiative Attachment/Toolbox of Assessment Methods (September 2000)*.

Ali A, Subhi Y, Ringsted C, and Konge L. 2015. Gender differences in the acquisition of surgical skills: a systematic review. *Surgical endoscopy* 29:3065-3073.

Archer E, Van Hoving DJ, and De Villiers A. 2015. In search of an effective teaching approach for skill acquisition and retention: Teaching manual defibrillation to junior medical students. *African Journal of Emergency Medicine* 5:54-59.

Balafoutas D, Joukhadar R, Kiesel M, Häusler S, Loeb S, Woeckel A, and Herr D. 2019. The Role of Deconstructive Teaching in the Training of Laparoscopy. *JSLS : Journal of the Society of Laparoendoscopic Surgeons* 23.

Bode R, Moore D, Clarke D, Beasley A, Foti J, Caputo G, and Kelleher K. 2012. A prospective randomized trial of the effectiveness of lumbar puncture simulation training in pediatric residents. *Academic Pediatrics* 12:e12-e13.

Bube S, Konge L, and Hansen RB. 2017. Simulation-based training for flexible cystoscopy-A patient transfer randomized trial. *Scandinavian Journal of Urology* 51:36.

Cameron JL. 1997. William Stewart Halsted. Our surgical heritage. *Annals of surgery* 225:445.

Cohen J. 1992. A power primer. *Psychological bulletin* 112:155.

Craven CL, Cooke M, Rangeley C, Alberti S, and Murphy M. 2018. Developing a pediatric neurosurgical training model. *Journal of Neurosurgery Pediatrics* 21:329-335.

546 Custers EJ, Regehr G, McCulloch W, Peniston C, and Reznick R. 1999. The Effects of Modeling
547 on Learning a Simple Surgical Procedure: See One, Do One or See Many, Do One?
548 *Advances in Health Sciences Education* 4:123-143.
549 Easton G, Stratford-Martin J, and Atherton H. 2012. An appraisal of the literature on teaching
550 physical examination skills. *Education for Primary Care* 23:246-254.
551 Elbourne DR, Altman DG, Higgins JP, Curtin F, Worthington HV, and Vail A. 2002. Meta-
552 analyses involving cross-over trials: methodological issues. *International journal of*
553 *epidemiology* 31:140-149.
554 Gradl-Dietsch G, Hitpas L, Gueorguiev B, Nebelung S, Schrading S, and Knobe M. 2019.
555 Undergraduate Curricular Training in Musculoskeletal Ultrasound by Student Teachers:
556 The Impact of Peyton's Four-Step Approach. *Zeitschrift fur Orthopadie &*
557 *Unfallchirurgie* 157:270-278.
558 Gradl-Dietsch G, Lübke C, Horst K, Simon M, Modabber A, Sönmez TT, Münker R, Nebelung
559 S, and Knobe M. 2016. Peyton's four-step approach for teaching complex spinal
560 manipulation techniques - a prospective randomized trial. *BMC medical education*
561 16:284.
562 Gradl-Dietsch G, Menon AK, Gürsel A, Götzenich A, Hatam N, Aljalloud A, Schrading S, Hölzl
563 F, and Knobe M. 2018. Basic echocardiography for undergraduate students: a comparison
564 of different peer-teaching approaches. *European journal of trauma and emergency*
565 *surgery : official publication of the European Trauma Society* 44:143-152.
566 Grantcharov TP, and Reznick RK. 2008. Teaching procedural skills. *Bmj* 336:1129-1131.
567 Greif R, Egger L, Basciani RM, Lockey A, and Vogt A. 2010. Emergency skill training--a
568 randomized controlled study on the effectiveness of the 4-stage approach compared to
569 traditional clinical teaching. *Resuscitation* 81:1692-1697.
570 Halsted WS. 1904. The training of the surgeon. *Bull Johns Hop Hosp*:267-275. {Halsted, 1904
571 #45}
572 Handley JA, and Handley AJ. 1998. Four-step CPR - Improving skill retention. *Resuscitation*
573 36:3-8.
574 Herrmann-Werner A, Nikendei C, Keifenheim K, Bosse HM, Lund F, Wagner R, Celebi N,
575 Zipfel S, and Weyrich P. 2013. "Best Practice" Skills Lab Training vs. a "see one, do
576 one" Approach in Undergraduate Medical Education: An RCT on Students' Long-Term
577 Ability to Perform Procedural Clinical Skills. *PloS one* 8.
578 Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Jüni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, Savović J, Schulz KF,
579 Weeks L, and Sterne JA. 2011. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of
580 bias in randomised trials. *Bmj* 343:d5928.
581 Higgins JP, and Green S. 2011. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*: John
582 Wiley & Sons.
583 Higgins JP, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, and Welch VA. 2019. *Cochrane*
584 *handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*: John Wiley & Sons.
585 Hill C, Reardon R, Joing S, Falvey D, and Miner J. 2010. Cricothyrotomy technique using gum
586 elastic bougie is faster than standard technique: A study of emergency medicine residents
587 and medical students in an animal lab. *Academic Emergency Medicine* 17:666-669.
588 Holmes JF, Panacek EA, Sakles JC, and Brofeldt BT. 1998. Comparison of 2 cricothyrotomy
589 techniques: Standard method versus rapid 4-step technique. *Annals of Emergency*
590 *Medicine* 32:442-447.

591 IntHout J, Ioannidis JP, and Borm GF. 2014. The Hartung-Knapp-Sidik-Jonkman method for
592 random effects meta-analysis is straightforward and considerably outperforms the
593 standard DerSimonian-Laird method. *BMC medical research methodology* 14:25.
594 Jenko M, Frangež M, and Manohin A. 2012. Four-stage teaching technique and chest
595 compression performance of medical students compared to conventional technique.
596 *Croatian medical journal* 53:486-495.
597 Kotsis SV, and Chung KC. 2013. Application of see one, do one, teach one concept in surgical
598 training. *Plastic and reconstructive surgery* 131:1194.
599 Krautter M, Dittrich R, Safi A, Krautter J, Maatouk I, Moeltner A, Herzog W, and Nikendei C.
600 2015. Peyton's four-step approach: differential effects of single instructional steps on
601 procedural and memory performance - a clarification study. *Advances in Medical*
602 *Education & Practice* 6:399-406.
603 Krautter M, Weyrich P, Schultz JH, Buss SJ, Maatouk I, Ünger JJ, and Nikendei C. 2011. Effects
604 of peyton's four-step approach on objective performance measures in technical skills
605 training: A controlled trial. *Teaching and learning in medicine* 23:244-250.
606 Lapucci G, Bondi B, Rubbi I, Cremonini V, Moretti E, Di Lorenzo R, Magnani D, and Ferri P.
607 2018. A randomized comparison trial of two and four-step approaches to teaching cardio-
608 pulmonary reanimation. *Acta Biomedica* 89:37-44.
609 Liu B, and Hunt LM. 2017. A single-blinded experimental study on task-shifting: Assessing the
610 acquisition of new surgical skills between medically qualified and non-medically
611 qualified surgical trainees in a low resource area. *Colorectal Disease* 19:55.
612 Lom B. 2012. Classroom activities: simple strategies to incorporate student-centered activities
613 within undergraduate science lectures. *Journal of Undergraduate Neuroscience*
614 *Education* 11:A64.
615 Lund F, Schultz JH, Maatouk I, Krautter M, Möltner A, Werner A, Weyrich P, Jünger J, and
616 Nikendei C. 2012. Effectiveness of IV cannulation skills laboratory training and its
617 transfer into clinical practice: A randomized, controlled trial. *PloS one* 7.
618 Ma IW, Zalunardo N, Pachev G, Beran T, Brown M, Hatala R, and McLaughlin K. 2012.
619 Comparing the use of global rating scale with checklists for the assessment of central
620 venous catheterization skills using simulation. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*
621 17:457-470.
622 Marshall IJ, Kuiper J, and Wallace BC. 2015. RobotReviewer: evaluation of a system for
623 automatically assessing bias in clinical trials. *Journal of the American Medical*
624 *Informatics Association* 23:193-201.
625 McLeod PJ, Steinert Y, Trudel J, and Gottesman R. 2001. Seven principles for teaching
626 procedural and technical skills. *Academic medicine: journal of the Association of*
627 *American Medical Colleges* 76:1080-1080.
628 Michels ME, Evans DE, and Blok GA. 2012. What is a clinical skill? Searching for order in
629 chaos through a modified Delphi process. *Medical teacher* 34:e573-e581.
630 Mishra B, and Dornan T. 2003. Training junior doctors in complex skills. *Medical education*
631 37:672-673.
632 Moher D, Altman DG, Liberati A, and Tetzlaff J. 2011. PRISMA statement. *Epidemiology*
633 22:128.
634 Münster T, Stosch C, Hindrichs N, Franklin J, and Matthes J. 2016. Peyton's 4-Steps-Approach
635 in comparison: Medium-term effects on learning external chest compression - a pilot
636 study. *GMS journal for medical education* 33:Doc60.

637 Nikendei C, Huber J, Stiepak J, Huhn D, Lauter J, Herzog W, Junger J, and Krautter M. 2014.
638 Modification of Peyton's four-step approach for small group teaching - a descriptive
639 study. *BMC medical education* 14:68.
640 Oermann MH, Muckler VC, and Morgan B. 2016. Framework for teaching psychomotor and
641 procedural skills in nursing. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing* 47:278-
642 282.
643 Orde S, Celenza A, and Pinder M. 2010. A randomised trial comparing a 4-stage to 2-stage
644 teaching technique for laryngeal mask insertion. *Resuscitation* 81:1687-1691.
645 Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, and Elmagarmid A. 2016. Rayyan—a web and mobile
646 app for systematic reviews. *Systematic reviews* 5:210.
647 R Core Team. 2019. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
648 Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria.
649 Regehr G, MacRae H, Reznick R, and Szalay D. 1998. Comparing the psychometric properties
650 of checklists and global rating scales for assessing performance on an OSCE-format
651 examination. *Academic Medicine* 73:993-997.
652 Rohrich RJ. 2006. “See one, do one, teach one”: an old adage with a new twist. LWW.
653 Romero P, Günther P, Kowalewski KF, Friedrich M, Schmidt MW, Trent SM, De La Garza JR,
654 Müller-Stich BP, and Nickel F. 2018. Halsted's “See One, Do One, and Teach One”
655 versus Peyton's Four-Step Approach: A Randomized Trial for Training of Laparoscopic
656 Suturing and Knot Tying. *Journal of Surgical Education* 75:510-515.
657 Rossettini G, Rondoni A, Palese A, Cecchetto S, Vicentini M, Bettale F, Furri L, and Testa M.
658 2017. Effective teaching of manual skills to physiotherapy students: a randomised clinical
659 trial. *Medical education* 51:826-838.
660 Ruesseler M, Tomczak M, Thrun M, Pfau S, Marzi I, and Sterz J. 2019. The Influence of the
661 Instructional Approach on Acquiring Clinical Skills in Surgery: A Comparative
662 Effectiveness Study. *Journal of Surgical Education* 76:140-149.
663 Sattelmayer M, Elsig S, Hilfiker R, and Baer G. 2016. A systematic review and meta-analysis of
664 selected motor learning principles in physiotherapy and medical education. *BMC medical*
665 *education* 16:15.
666 Sattelmayer M, Hilfiker R, and Baer G. 2017. A systematic review of assessments for procedural
667 skills in physiotherapy education/Assessment von prozeduralen Fähigkeiten in der
668 physiotherapeutischen Ausbildung: Ein systematischer Review. *International Journal of*
669 *Health Professions* 4:53-65.
670 Schroder H, Henke A, Stieger L, Beckers S, Biermann H, Rossaint R, and Sopka S. 2017.
671 Influence of learning styles on the practical performance after the four-step basic life
672 support training approach - An observational cohort study. *PLoS ONE [Electronic*
673 *Resource]* 12:e0178210.
674 Schwarzer G. 2007. meta: An R package for meta-analysis. *R news* 7:40-45.
675 Seymour-Walsh A, Worley P, Vnuk A, and Grantham H. 2015. Is patient morbidity and
676 mortality improved with a skill teaching strategy embedded in learning theory?
677 *Resuscitation* 96:85.
678 Skrzypek A, Gorecki T, Krawczyk P, Podolec M, Cebula G, Jablonski K, Szeliga M, and
679 Nowakowski M. 2018. Implementation of the modified four-step approach method for
680 teaching echocardiography using the FATE protocol-A pilot study. *Echocardiography*
681 35:1705-1712.

682 Smith J, Moe D, McClellan J, Sohn V, Long W, and Martin M. 2019. See one, do one, but never
683 teach one? An analysis of resident teaching assist cases under various levels of attending
684 supervision. *American Journal of Surgery* 217:918-922.
685 Sopka S, Biermann H, Rossaint R, Knott S, Skorning M, Brokmann JC, Heussen N, and Beckers
686 SK. 2012. Evaluation of a newly developed media-supported 4-step approach for basic
687 life support training. *Scandinavian journal of trauma, resuscitation and emergency*
688 *medicine* 20:37.
689 Swing SR. 2002. Assessing the ACGME general competencies: general considerations and
690 assessment methods. *Academic Emergency Medicine* 9:1278-1288.
691 Tommaso CL. 2016. Learning curves for TAVR: Not quite see one, do one teach one.
692 *Catheterization & Cardiovascular Interventions* 87:163-164.
693 Velmahos GC, Toutouzas KG, Sillin LF, Chan L, Clark RE, Theodorou D, and Maupin F. 2004.
694 Cognitive task analysis for teaching technical skills in an inanimate surgical skills
695 laboratory. *American Journal of Surgery* 187:114-119.
696 Walker M, and Peyton J. 1998. Teaching in theatre. *Teaching and learning in medical practice*
697 *Rickmansworth, UK: Manticore Europe Limited*:171-180.
698 Wirth S, William YA, Paolini M, Wirth K, Maxien D, Reiser M, and Fischer MR. 2018.
699 Improvement of Radiological Teaching - Effects of Focusing of Learning Targets and
700 Increased Consideration of Learning Theory Knowledge. *RoFo Fortschritte auf dem*
701 *Gebiet der Rontgenstrahlen und der Bildgebenden Verfahren* 190:161-174.
702 Wulf G, and Shea CH. 2002. Principles derived from the study of simple skills do not generalize
703 to complex skill learning. *Psychonomic bulletin & review* 9:185-211.
704 Yoganathan S, Finch DA, Parkin E, and Pollard J. 2018. 360degree virtual reality video for the
705 acquisition of knot tying skills: A randomised controlled trial. *International Journal of*
706 *Surgery* 54:24-27.
707

Figure 1

Prisma flow diagram


Identification
Screening
Eligibility
Included
Records identified through database searching (n = 482)
Additional records identified through other sources (n = 5)
Records after duplicates removed (n = 442)
Records screened (n = 442)
Records excluded (n = 405)
Full-text articles assessed for eligibility (n = 37)
Full-text articles excluded, with reasons (n = 23 intervention n = 12 design n = 8 missing data n = 2 outcome n = 1)
Studies included in qualitative synthesis (n = 14)
Studies included in quantitative synthesis (meta-analysis) (n = 14)

Figure 2

Forest plot performance - Peyton's 4 step versus standard teaching at post-acquisition testing

Pey: Peyton's teaching; St: standard teaching; PeerPey: peer Peyton's teaching; PeerSt: peer standard teaching; PeerBpsl: peer best practice skills lab; MPey: Media supported Peyton

NB. Gradl-Dietsch et al. (2018) and Gradl-Dietsch et al. (2016) are presented as two samples because data for women and men are analysed separately (a: woman, b: men). Data from Herrmann-Werner et al. (2013) are presented as two samples (a: participants with a 3 months follow up, b: participants with a 6 months follow up)



Figure 3

Forest plot performance - Peyton's 4 step versus standard teaching at retention testing

PeerPey: peer Peyton's teaching; PeerSt: peer standard teaching; Pey: Peyton's teaching; St: standard teaching



Figure 4

Forest plot time needed for procedure - Peyton's 4 step versus standard teaching at post-acquisition testing;

PeerPey: peer Peyton's teaching; PeerSt: peer standard teaching; Pey: Peyton's teaching; St: standard teaching



Figure 5

Scatterplot metaregression students per teacher as predictor for performance at post-acquisition testing



Figure 6

Summary risk of bias plot



Table 1(on next page)

Characteristics of included studies

1 Table 1. Characteristics of included studies
2

Study	Design/ Country	Participants	Procedure trained*	Teaching approach in experimental group	Teaching approach in control group	Student teacher ratio	Outcome measurements*	Endpoints
Balafoutas et al. (2019)	RCT/ Germany	n = 16 residents in obstetrics and gynaecology	Laparoscopic suturing and knot-tying training	Deconstruction of teaching practical clinical skills in 4 steps (demonstration, deconstruction, comprehension, execution)	Traditional Halsted teaching (demonstration followed by execution)	1:1	Objective Structured Assessment of Technical Skills tool; number of correct knots; mean time required for knot tying	Post-test (after the training)
Gradl-Dietsch et al. (2019)	Randomised cross over study/ Germany	n = 491 second year medical students	Musculoskeletal ultrasound (shoulder and knee joint)	Peer teaching according to the Peyton method (demonstration, deconstruction, comprehension, execution)	Peer teaching (demonstration and execution)	9:1	Objective structured practical examination; binary performance checklist; global rating scale; time required	Post-test 2 weeks after training
Gradl-Dietsch et al. (2016)	RCT/ Germany	n = 95 third to fifth year medical students	Manual therapy and specific manipulative and diagnostic techniques for the spine	Instructions following the approach of Peyton. Steps 1 and 2 within group. Steps 3 and 4 individually (demonstrate, talk the trainee through,	Standard instructions (demonstration and practice)	1:1	Objective Structured Practical Examination; binary performance checklist; Multiple choice exam (principles of manual therapy)	Post-test (4 weeks after training), retention test (6 month)

				trainee talks trainer through, trainee does)				
Gradl-Dietsch et al. (2018)	4-arm RCT (the arms peer teaching and Peyton peer teaching were included)/ Germany	n = 38 second year medical students	Echocardiography including technical requirements and patient preparation	Peer teachers demonstrated according to Peyton's approach (demonstrate, talk the trainee through, trainee talks trainer through, trainee does)	Peer teaching (peer teachers demonstrated the procedure; students then practised the skills on each other)	3:1 for peer Peyton; n.a. for peer teaching	Objective structured practical examination; binary performance checklist; global rating scale; multiple choice test	Post-test (2 weeks after the training)
Herrmann-Werner et al. (2013)	4 arm RCT/ Germany	n = 94 undergraduate medical students	Nasogastral tube insertion and intravenous cannulation	Student tutors supervised a best practice skills laboratory training consisting of structured individual feedback, performance on manikins and Peyton's "Four-Step-Approach (demonstration, deconstruction, comprehension, performance)	Student tutors supervised a "see one, do one", teaching	3:1	Video recordings of performances were evaluated with binary and global checklists; amount of time needed	Post-test (immediately after training) and retention test (6 months after the training)

Jenko et al. (2012)	RCT/ Slovenia	N = 126 first-year medical students	Cardiopulmonary resuscitation	Peyton's 4 stage approach (demonstration, deconstruction, formulation, performance)	2-stage approach (demonstration slow speed and commentary followed by performance)	12:1	Performance scores measured with the manikin: compression depth, rate and hand placement	Post-test (immediately after training)
Krautter et al. (2011)	RCT/ Germany	n = 34 second- and third-year medical students	Gastric-tube insertion using a manikin	Peyton's Four-Step Approach (demonstrate, talk the trainee through, trainee talks trainer through, trainee does)	Standard instructions: consisting of demonstration with detailed commentary and time to ask questions	1:1	Acceptance ratings, length of time for instructions, lengths of time for first independent performance, video ratings of performance including (binary checklist and global rating scale)	Post-test
Lapucci et al. (2018)	RCT/ Italy	n = 60 first- and second-year nursing students	Cardio-Pulmonary Reanimation	Peyton's 4-step teaching method (demonstrate, deconstruction, comprehension, execution)	2 step method described by Orde (Peyton's step 2 and step 4).	10:1	Performance scores: insufficient chest compressions, excessive chest compressions, effective chest compressions and effective ventilations	Post-test (after training)
Lund et al.	RCT/ Germany	n = 84 first-	Intravenous	Training in a skills	Traditional	3:1	Video rating with	Post-test in

(2012)		year medical students	cannulation on a part-task-trainer model in the shape of a human arm	lab using Peyton's 4 step approach	bedside teaching based on "see one, do one".		binary checklist, global rating scale, time needed and number of attempts and patient ratings	clinical setting with volunteer students.
Münster et al. (2016)	3-arm RCT (the arms Peyton and standard teaching were included)/ Germany	n = 103 second- and third- semester medical students	Cardiopulmonary resuscitation	Student tutors used Peyton's 4 step approach (demonstration, deconstruction, modified step comprehension for groups, execution)	Student tutors used a standard teaching method: Peyton's step 2 and 4 (deconstruction and performance steps)	median group size 13	Binary performance checklist and performance data of the resuscitation phantom	Post-test (1 week after training), retention test 5-6 month after training)
Orde et al. (2010)	RCT/ Australia	n = 120 final year medical students, nurses and student nurses	Insertion of a Laryngeal Mask Airway on an airway training manikin	4-stage teaching (demonstration, deconstruction, formulation, performance)	2-stage teaching (deconstruction and performance steps)	n.a.	Time taken for insertion, number of steps correctly and incorrectly performed, and number of steps omitted	Post-test (immediately after training), retention test (2 months after training)
Romero et al. (2018)	RCT/ Germany	n = 60 third- to sixth-year medical students	Intracorporal suturing and knot tying	Peyton's Four-Step approach (demonstration, deconstruction, comprehension, performance)	Halsted teaching; the teacher demonstrated once afterwards the students practiced on their	1:1	Objective Structured Assessment of Technical Skills (OSATS) with checklist and global rating scale,	Performance of last suture (practice trial) was assessed

					own		Performance score, procedural implementation, knot quality, task time, and suture placement accuracy	
Rossettini et al. (2017)	RCT/ Italy	n = 39 third-year undergraduate physiotherapy students	Cervical C1- C2 spine mobilisation	Teaching using Peyton's four-step approach (demonstration, deconstruction, comprehension, performance)	"See one, do one" approach as reported by Herrmann-Werner et al. (2013)	3:1	Performance checklist, time to teach; time to perform and student satisfaction	Post-test (after training), retention tests (1 week and 1 month after training)
Ruesseler et al. (2019)	Randomised controlled cohort study with 4-arms (the arms "video 4-step approach" and "See One - Do One") were included)/ Germany	n = 73 fourth-year medical students	Six procedures including three basic surgical skills (replacement of a complex wound dressing, sterile covering, and performance of a suture)	Video 4-step approach: video supported step 1 and 2, the steps 3 and 4 were performed as reported by Peyton	"See one, do one", a trainer demonstrated the skill and explained. Followed by practice under supervision	max. 6:1	OSCE with 6 stations, performance was rated on trinary checklist	Post-test (during training week)

*if multiple procedures or assessments were used in the primary studies the included procedures and assessments within this systematics review are underlined.

6