

Study Protocol

Comparative evaluation of Syndicate with Conventional method of Case Discussion by the Post Graduates from Dept. of Orthodontics.

Abstract

Background: Basics of every aspect must be know thoroughly to JR1 with active participation during the discussion to understand any case. Active participation is must irrespective of the syllabus distributed for the PG in the syllabus as per the DCI guidelines. The cognitive knowledge, clinically for any case should not be year specific based on the syllabus, but, a collective and collaborative foundation of understanding. So to reframe the methodology of and to make the case discussion more effective , a study was planned.

Study design: cross- sectional observational

Methodology: the following study will be conducted with the JR of dept of orthodontics SPDC, For comparison between the conventional and syndicate case discussion, the conventional case discussion will be entitled as Group I; while syndicate case discussion will be entitles as group II. They will be asked to present the case as per the suggested syllabus recommended by the DCI for each academic year respectively. Pre-test and post-test feedback will be taken after each presentation. Also, perception form the faulty as well as the post graduates will be taken after each presentation.

Expected Outcome: the detailed case discussion from the etiology and treatment modality to the retention phase can help the JRI to understand the basics of any case. The feedback and posttest of the syndicate format might be a better way to present as compared to the conventional method.

Conclusion: The syndicate case discussion is a better way to understand any case from the initial stage to the last stage of retention with inclusion of all the JR in the presentation of a case.

Key words: JR, syndicate case discussion, orthodontic case

Introduction

In the process of learning students are expected to extract maximum knowledge. Basics of every aspect must be known thoroughly to JR1 with active participation during the discussion to understand any case. ¹

35 When the JR3 is presenting a case report in a PG activity except the basics the further
36 presentation is not clear to the JR1 if they have not read the article prior to presentation.

37 Active participation is must irrespective of the syllabus distributed for the PG in the syllabus as
38 per the DCI guidelines.

39 The cognitive knowledge, clinically for any case should not be year specific based on the
40 syllabus, but, a collective and collaborative foundation of understanding.

41 When it comes to a clinical case report mostly it is seen that the students are allotted the
42 responsibilities to learn the case based on the envelope defined to them by the syllabus framed by
43 the council. Whereas it can be hypothesized that basic knowledge of the 2nd and 3rd year syllabus
44 if presented by the JR1 can activate the thinking process in the initial days of learning thus
45 giving a scope to learn and implement for further scope and recent advances when they are
46 promoted to next year of their post-graduation; which is even true for the JR3.

47 So to reframe the methodology of and to make the case discussion more effective, a study was
48 planned

49 **Aim:**

50 To evaluate and compare the Syndicate with Conventional method of Case Discussion by the
51 Post Graduates from Dept. of Orthodontics

52 **Objectives:**

53 1. To sensitize syndicate case discussion as a teaching learning modality in Post graduate
54 teaching programme

55 2. To evaluate the level of understanding of a case discussion through conventional
56 method using pre and post test

57 3. To evaluate the level of understanding of a case discussion through syndicate method
58 using pre and post test

59 4. To compare the pre and post test for conventional and syndicate method individually
60 and with each other using ALG score

61 5. To evaluate and compare the perception of faculty regarding syndicate case discussion

62 6. To evaluate and compare the perception of post graduates regarding syndicate case
63 discussion

64 7. To frame the methodology for a syndicate case discussion.

65

66 **Study design:** cross- sectional observational

67 **Duration of the study:** 1 year

68 **Methodology**

69 The study will be conducted in the Department of Orthodontics, SPDC with the guidance of
70 SHPER, DMIMS(DU), after the receipt of the approval from the institutional ethical committee
71 DMIMS(DU). All the 18 Post graduates and the faculty from HOD, Professor to Asst. Professor
72 from the department will be participating in the research.

73 While, under graduate students and Post graduates and Faculty from other dept will be excluded
74 from the study.

75 For comparison between the conventional and syndicate case discussion, the conventional case
76 discussion will be entitled as Group I; where, 3 post graduates one from each academic year will
77 be randomly selected to present a case in PG activity. They will be asked to present the case as
78 per the suggested syllabus recommended by the DCI for each academic year respectively. Where
79 in JR1 may focus more on etiology and classification and basics, JR2 may focus more on the
80 diagnosis part while JR3 may focus more on the treatment modalities.

81 Pre test and post test feedback will be taken after each presentation. Also, perception form the
82 faculty as well as the post graduates will be taken after each presentation.

83 The syndicate case discussion will be entitled as Group II; where one Postgraduate each from the
84 academic year will present one case report. 3 days prior to the presentation the abstract of the
85 case report and the article will be given to the faculty and PGs for their referral. As guided to
86 prepare the presentation, JR1 – will focus on review, etiology, incidence, etc with brief
87 introduction of the complete case. JR2 will focus on Differential diagnosis, review, tool is
88 diagnosis, etc with brief introduction of various treatment modalities while JR3 is expected to
89 compile data along with discussion, treatment modalities, future scope, meta analytic review,
90 references, clinical implication, recent advances, etc. two such case discussion will be conducted
91 in the department.

92 Pre test and post test feedback will be taken after each presentation. Also, perception form the
93 faculty as well as the post graduates will be taken after each presentation.

94

95 **PERCEPTIONS REGARDING SYNDICATE CASE DISCUSSION**

96 FACULTY: _____

97 JR: 1 / 2 / 3

Sr. No	Items	SD	D	N	A	SA
	The purpose / objective of Syndicate Case Discussion are clear to the participating residents and faculty					
	Learning objectives relevant for each participating resident and faculty are defined in advance and circulated.					

	Syndicate Case Discussion gives detailed in-depth explanation of a case, its management with justification and its outcome, helped in better understanding					
	After presentation, open discussion of article in the Syndicate Case Discussion is useful					
	Syndicate Case Discussion improves the knowledge and motivation for postgraduates to participate in Post graduate activity					
	Syndicate Case Discussion promotes self directed learning					
	Syndicate Case Discussion can motivate post raduates in future application of knowledge					
	Adequate cooperation of residents and faculty is sought, they learn to help and respond to complete the task					
	The students enjoyed learning through syndicate way as compared to the conventional way					
	Syndicate Case Discussion should be made a regular part of curriculum					
	Sufficient time was provided to the students for preparing Syndicate Case Discussion					

98

99

100

101

102 **Opinion / suggestions about Syndicate Case Discussion:**

103 1. What according to you was the most useful aspect of Syndicate Case Discussion?

104

105

106 2. What were the limitations/ shortcomings of Syndicate Case Discussion?

107

108

109

110 3. Please give your suggestions for improving the quality of Syndicate Case Discussion.

111

112

113

114 **Need Analysis**

115 Faculty:_____

116 JR__1 / 2 / 3

117 1. Are you familiar with the term syndicate

118

119 2. Why does a post graduate present a case report in a PG activity?

120

121 3. What is expected from a post graduate after attending a case report in a post graduate?

122

123 4. If a JR3 is presenting a case report in PG activity, are the basics of the topic covered in
124 details with crystal clear concepts to the JR1?

125

126 5. How can it be rectified?

127

128 6. Kindly suggest and comment on : should a case report be divided based on the cognitive
129 knowledge and syllabus for a JR from each year explaining the details accordingly.

130

131

132

133

134 **Statistical analysis:**

135 • Pretest & Posttest will be assessed by ALG score will be compared for group I and II.
136 (presenter and listener)

137 • Faculty and staff perception will be assessed as follows.

138 - Closed question – LIKERT scale

139 - Open question – quantitative assessment (manual content analysis method)

140

141 **Expected Outcome:** the detailed case discussion from the etiology and treatment modality to the
142 retention phase can help the JRI to understand the basics of any case. The feedback and posttest
143 of the syndicate format might be a better way to present as compared to the conventional
144 method.

145 **Discussion:**

146 In 2015 Lohe et. al. ² evaluated effectiveness of syndicate learning in oral medicine and
147 radiology for UG students, where they concluded that syndicate learning is more interesting,
148 becomes a platform for creative interchanging of ideas and a live session for a meaningful
149 participation and discussion.

150 In 2019 Ingole et. al. ³ published a copyright on Incorporating Syndicate journal club in
151 postgraduate teaching programme at DMIMS, where the syndicate teaching learning enhanced
152 presentation skill and mastered the ability to critically appraise the evidence

153 In 2019 Uppal et. al. ⁴⁻⁵ introduced syndicate teaching learning in first MBBS students and
154 concluded that this technique has better retention of knowledge and exchange of idea. ⁶⁻⁹

155 **Conclusion:**

156 The syndicate case discussion is a better way to understand any case from the initial stage to the
157 last stage of retention with inclusion of all the JR in the presentation of a case.

158

159 **Bibliography:**

- 160 1. Dian Novita. Syndicate learning: an alternative approach for teaching extensive reading.
161 *Journal of languages and language teaching*. 2018;6(1).
- 162 2. Lohe V, Singh A. Evaluation of effectiveness of syndicate learning in oral medicine and
163 radiology:cardinal finding in batch of final year students. *Medical Education Back t*
164 *Basics* 2015;1(4):301-304.
- 165 3. Incorporating Syndicate journal club in postgraduate teaching programme at DMIMS –
166 Dr. Abhishek Ingole, Dr Sunita Wagh, Dr Ved Prakash Mishra. Copyright published L-
167 86559/2019.30/10/2019
- 168 4. Uppal N, Kukreja S, Kaur J, Kaur A, Sharma A. Introducing syndicate as a teaching
169 learning technique in first professional MBBS students. *Int J clin Biochem Res*
170 2019;6(3):389-395.
- 171 5. Rai A, Datarkar A, Borle RM. Are maxillomandibular fixation screws a better option
172 than Erich arch bars in achieving maxillomandibular fixation? A randomized clinical
173 study. *Journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery*. 2011 Dec 1;69(12):3015-8.
- 174 6. Agrawal A, Timothy J, Cincu R, Agarwal T, Waghmare LB. Bradycardia in
175 neurosurgery. *Clinical neurology and neurosurgery*. 2008 Apr 1;110(4):321-7.
- 176 7. Bourne R, Steinmetz JD, Flaxman S, Briant PS, Taylor HR, Resnikoff S, Casson RJ,
177 Abdoli A, Abu-Gharbieh E, Afshin A, Ahmadi H. Trends in prevalence of blindness
178 and distance and near vision impairment over 30 years: an analysis for the Global Burden
179 of Disease Study. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2021 Feb 1;9(2):e130-43.
- 180 8. Borle RM, Nimonkar PV, Rajan R. Extended nasolabial flaps in the management of oral
181 submucous fibrosis. *British Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*. 2009 Jul
182 1;47(5):382-5.
- 183 9. Franklin RC, Peden AE, Hamilton EB, Bisignano C, Castle CD, Dingels ZV, Hay SI, Liu
184 Z, Mokdad AH, Roberts NL, Sylte DO. The burden of unintentional drowning: global,
185 regional and national estimates of mortality from the Global Burden of Disease 2017
186 Study. *Injury prevention*. 2020 Oct 1;26(Suppl 1):i83-95.