

1 International medical graduates' experiences of clinical
2 competency assessment in postgraduate and licensing
3 examinations: a scoping review protocol.

4 Helen Hynes ^{1¶*}, Anél Wiese ^{1¶}, Nora McCarthy ^{1¶}, Catherine Sweeney ^{1#}, Tony Foley ^{2,3#},
5 Deirdre Bennett ^{1#}

6

- 7 1. Medical Education Unit, School of Medicine, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland
8 2. Department of General Practice, School of Medicine, University College Cork, Cork,
9 Ireland.
10 3. Irish College of General Practitioners, Dublin, Ireland

11

12 ***Corresponding author**

13 Email: h.hynes@ucc.ie

14

15 ¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

16 # These authors also contributed equally to this work.

17

18 Abstract

19 An international medical graduate (IMG) is a doctor who has received their basic medical
20 qualification from a medical school located in a different country from that in which they
21 practice or intend to practice. IMGs are known to face difficulties in their working lives,
22 including differential attainment in assessment.

23

24 The objective of this review is to map key concepts and types of evidence in academic and
25 gray literature relating to international medical graduates' experiences of clinical
26 competency assessment and to identify knowledge gaps on this topic by systematically
27 searching, selecting, and synthesizing existing knowledge.

28

29 All studies will relate to IMGs. The concept of interest will be IMGs' experiences of
30 assessment. The context will be postgraduate, licensing or credentialing medical
31 assessments of clinical competence.

32

33 This review will be conducted in accordance with the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI)
34 methodology for scoping reviews. Seven electronic databases will be searched for literature
35 published between 2009 and 2024: the Australian Education Index, British Education Index,
36 ERIC, PubMed, PsycINFO, Scopus, and SocINDEX. Gray literature will be searched using
37 Google, Google Scholar, and published reports from postgraduate training bodies and
38 medical licensing organizations. Documents will be independently screened, selected, and
39 extracted by two researchers using a piloted data-extraction tool. Data will be analyzed and
40 presented in tables and in a narrative format.

41 **Scoping review registration:**

42 Open Science Framework: <https://osf.io/8gdm7>

43 Introduction

44 The term ‘international medical graduate’ (IMG) refers to a doctor who received their basic
45 medical qualification from a medical school located in a different country from that in which
46 they practice or intend to practice.^{1,2} In 2021, nearly one-fifth (19%) of doctors across OECD
47 countries had obtained at least their basic medical qualification in another country, up from
48 15% a decade earlier, with the percentage of foreign-trained doctors currently exceeding
49 24% in Canada, 31% in the UK, 32% in Australia, 40% in Ireland, and 42% in New Zealand.³

50

51 International medical graduates often fill in gaps in healthcare provision and are more likely
52 to work in underserved areas or in non-training service positions.^{4,5} Many studies have
53 shown that IMGs experience adaptation difficulties when beginning to work in a new
54 country, including professional disorientation, integration difficulties, and barriers to
55 training entry.^{1,2,6,7} A number of recent systematic and scoping reviews have examined the
56 evidence relating to IMGs’ integration difficulties and the discrimination they face in their
57 working lives.^{2,6,7} Common themes included inadequate professional recognition, lack of
58 opportunities, marginalization, subtle interpersonal exclusions, stereotypes, stigma, and
59 favoring local graduates. While many of the issues relating to unfavorable treatment may
60 affect IMGs’ performance and assessment outcomes, their experiences in relation to
61 assessment were not explored in these reviews.^{2,6,7}

62

63 Lack of training opportunities and difficulty in passing exams are cited reasons why IMGs
64 may be dissatisfied with work in their adopted countries.¹ There is a growing body of
65 evidence to suggest the existence of a discrepancy in postgraduate assessment performance

66 between IMGs and locally trained graduates.^{8,9} This gap between the attainment levels of
67 different groups of doctors is known as differential attainment.¹⁰ Differential attainment has
68 been observed when comparing examination performance and career progression between
69 IMGs, locally trained white doctors, and locally trained doctors from Black and Minority
70 Ethnic groups.¹¹ It has been observed in both licensing and postgraduate examinations.^{12,13}
71 The difference in attainment exists despite correcting for possible confounders.¹¹

72

73 Studies from the United Kingdom have revealed differential attainment in the assessments
74 for membership of postgraduate training bodies when IMGs' performance is compared with
75 UK graduates' performance.^{8,12,13} Differential attainment has been observed in knowledge-
76 based multiple-choice examinations^{14,15} as well as in clinical examinations.^{8,12} An
77 independent review in 2013 found that white UK trained candidates were four times more
78 likely to pass the Royal College of General Practitioners (RCGP) Clinical Skills Assessment
79 than ethnic minority UK trained candidates and 14 times more likely to pass than candidates
80 who had trained overseas.⁸ This finding led the British Association of Physicians of Indian
81 Origin to bring a judicial review against the RCGP and the General Medical Council (GMC)
82 claiming discrimination.¹⁶ This judicial review found that the RCGP was neither racially
83 discriminatory nor in breach of its public sector equality duty, but it highlighted that there
84 was a disparity in results between different groups, and that the RCGP must take action. It
85 concluded that "*If it [the RCGP] does not act and its failure to act is the subject of a further*
86 *challenge in the future, it may well be that it will be held to have breached its duty*"¹⁶ [p. 9].

87

88 Similar evidence of differential attainment has been reported in the United States, Canada,
89 Europe, and elsewhere.^{4,17-19} A study from Canada found that fewer than half of IMGs

90 passed their certification Objective Structured Clinical Examination, while almost all (93.5%)
91 Canadian and American graduates passed.¹⁷ Similarly, a study from Sweden, of candidates
92 taking an assessment at the end of internship, found that graduates from Swedish
93 universities had a failure rate of less than 4% in contrast to graduates from other EU
94 countries and non-EU graduates who failed at a rate of 21.2% and 41.6% respectively.¹⁸

95

96 The reasons for differential attainment are not fully understood. Differential attainment is
97 still evident, even when potential confounders are considered, such as pre-university
98 attainment and socioeconomic status²⁰ own and parents' first language, motivation for
99 being a doctor, study habits, living arrangements (home or away), and personality.²¹

100

101 Some possible explanations for differential attainment include barriers to training that IMGs
102 experience in their working lives, such as difficulty in accessing training positions, lack of
103 insight into the system, lack of clarity regarding educational supervisors, discrepancies in
104 training budgets, and access to study leave when compared with doctors in training
105 positions.^{5,22} A GMC report from 2019 highlighted the importance of support in the working
106 environment as a factor that promoted success in training progression. These supports
107 included an inclusive workplace, a supportive trainer, and support to navigate the process of
108 completing challenging professional examinations.²³

109

110 While differential attainment has been observed in knowledge-based assessment, this
111 scoping review project will focus specifically on publications related to clinical competence
112 assessment, including but not confined to OSCEs, workplace-based assessments, direct
113 observation of procedures, and mini-clinical examinations. Publications related to

114 knowledge-based assessments only will be excluded. The rationale for this is that there are
115 many qualitative differences between the experience of undergoing clinical competency
116 assessment and the experience of sitting knowledge-based written examinations,²⁴
117 including the dynamics between candidates, examiners, real patients, and simulated
118 patients that occur in clinical examinations but not in knowledge-based assessment.
119 Additionally, clinical assessment mirrors the day-to-day practice of medicine more closely
120 than knowledge-based written examinations and is therefore a very relevant measure of an
121 IMG's adaptation and integration into a new healthcare system.

122

123 A preliminary search of PubMed, the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, and *JBI*
124 *Evidence Synthesis* was conducted to determine what evidence exists regarding IMGs'
125 experiences in relation to postgraduate and medical licensing assessment. In 2015, the UK
126 GMC commissioned a rapid review to understand differential attainment across medical
127 training pathways.²⁵ This review found that most published studies focused on examination
128 outcomes, such as pass/fail and progression/non-progression outcomes, and did not
129 examine IMGs' experiences, opinions, or attitudes toward assessment. There have been no
130 further reviews on this topic since 2015, and no systematic or scoping reviews on the topic
131 of IMGs' experiences of clinical competency assessment were identified.

132

133 **Materials and Methods**

134 Scoping review methodology will be used. A scoping review is a method of knowledge
135 synthesis that addresses an exploratory research question and aims to map key concepts,
136 types of evidence, and gaps in research related to a specific field by systematically

137 searching, selecting, analyzing, and synthesizing existing knowledge in both peer-reviewed
138 and gray literature.²⁶ Because the aim of this review is to address a broad research question
139 and to map the existing academic and gray evidence related to the topic, we consider a
140 scoping review to be the most appropriate method for this study.

141

142 The proposed scoping review will follow the PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews
143 (PRISMA-ScR) reporting guidelines.²⁷ A filled PRISMA-ScR checklist can be viewed in
144 Appendix 1. The six-step framework devised by Arksey and O'Malley²⁸ and further enhanced
145 by Levac et al²⁹ will be used. These steps are: (i) identifying the research question, (ii)
146 identifying relevant studies, (iii) study selection, (iv) charting the data, (v) collating,
147 summarizing, and reporting the results, and (vi) consultation (optional). This review will be
148 conducted in accordance with the JBI methodology for scoping reviews.³⁰

149

150 Step 1: Identifying the research questions

151 The objective of this scoping review is to map key concepts and types of evidence in
152 academic and gray literature relating to IMGs' experiences of clinical competency
153 assessment and to identify the gaps in our knowledge on this topic by systematically
154 searching, selecting, analyzing, and synthesizing existing knowledge.

155

156 The research questions are:

- 157 1. What literature has been published relating to the experiences of international
158 medical graduates undertaking clinical postgraduate and licensing medical
159 examinations?

160 2. What experiences do international medical graduates describe in relation to clinical
161 postgraduate and licensing medical examinations?

162 3. What are the gaps in the literature relating to our knowledge and understanding of
163 international medical graduates' experiences of clinical postgraduate and licensing
164 medical examinations?

165

166 Step 2: Identifying relevant studies

167 This scoping review will consider peer-reviewed and gray literature. Qualitative,
168 quantitative, and mixed-methods studies will be included. Reports, reviews, theses, letters,
169 book chapters, opinion pieces, and organizational documents will also be considered.

170

171 *Inclusion criteria*

172 *Participants*

173 Studies will relate to international medical graduates. For this study, IMGs will be defined as
174 medical doctors practicing in a country other than that in which they received their basic
175 medical qualification. Studies relating to locally trained graduates and those that do not
176 differentiate between IMGs and locally trained graduates will be excluded. Studies related
177 to other healthcare professionals (not medical doctors) will also be excluded.

178 *Concept*

179 The concept of interest will be IMGs' experiences of clinical competency assessment.

180 *Context*

181 The context will be postgraduate, licensing, or credentialing medical assessment that
182 incorporates elements designed to measure clinical competence, including but not limited

183 to OSCEs, workplace-based assessments, direct observation of procedures, and mini-clinical
184 examinations. Studies that relate only to knowledge-based assessments, such as multiple-
185 choice assessments, will be excluded.

186

187 [Search strategy](#)

188 The search strategy will aim to identify published and unpublished studies. An initial limited
189 search of PubMed and Scopus was carried out to become familiar with the available
190 evidence and to identify common keywords associated with the study population and topic.
191 Subsequently, text words, index terms, and MESH headings from relevant articles were
192 combined to develop a full search strategy for the British Education Index, ERIC, PubMed,
193 Psych Info, Scopus, and Soc Index. The initial search of PubMed is provided in Appendix 2.
194 The search strategy, including all identified keywords and index terms, will be adapted for
195 each database and/or information source. A forward and backward citation search will be
196 conducted for all included sources of evidence to screen for additional studies.

197

198 Sources of unpublished studies or gray literature to be searched include Google, Google
199 Scholar, and reports of relevant stakeholders, such as postgraduate medical training bodies
200 and medical licensing organizations.

201

202 Publications from 2009 to 2024, which are available in the full text, will be considered for
203 inclusion. This date range was chosen to allow us to include studies regarding differential
204 attainment, which were mainly published from 2012 onwards, while bearing in mind that
205 postgraduate and licensing examinations are regularly reviewed and updated. Therefore,

206 experiences from previous iterations of assessment are not relevant to the current issues
207 faced by international medical graduates.

208

209 Step 3: Study/Source of Evidence selection

210 Following the search of all sources, identified citations will be collated and uploaded into
211 the Covidence systematic review software (Veritas Health Information, Melbourne,
212 Australia). Duplicates will be removed. A pilot test will be conducted to trial the inclusion
213 criteria. No language restrictions will be applied. From the initial searches, we believe that
214 the number of non-English language papers will be low. If the need arises, every effort will
215 be made to translate relevant papers into other languages.

216

217 After the pilot, three reviewers will use the inclusion and exclusion criteria (Table 1) to
218 screen the titles and abstracts of all citations, with two researchers independently screening
219 each item. Thereafter, full texts will be retrieved for sources that were identified as
220 potentially relevant, and these will be assessed in detail against the inclusion criteria by two
221 of the three independent reviewers. Sources that do not meet the inclusion criteria for full-
222 text review will be removed. The reasons for exclusion will be recorded and reported in the
223 scoping review. If any disagreements arise between the reviewers at any stage of the
224 selection process, these sources will be discussed, and if necessary, an additional reviewer
225 or reviewers will be involved in resolving the issue. The results of the search and the study
226 inclusion process will be documented in the final scoping review using the Preferred
227 Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Review
228 (PRISMA-ScR) flow diagram.²⁷

229

	Inclusion	Exclusion
Population	Data source relating to International Medical Graduates (medical doctors)	Sources relating to locally trained medical graduates. Sources which do not differentiate where the graduates trained. Sources relating to other health care professionals (not doctors).
Concept	Sources relating to the experiences of the participants	Sources which do not refer to the experiences of participants
Context	Sources relating to postgraduate medical examinations. Sources relating to licencing or credentialing medical examinations. Sources relating to clinical competence assessment (including but not confined to OSCEs, Workplace based assessments, Direct Observation of Procedures, Mini-Clinical Examinations)	Sources relating to undergraduate medical examinations. Sources relating only to knowledge-based assessment (e.g., MCQs)
Types of sources	Qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods studies; 'grey' literature such as reports, reviews, theses, letters, book chapters, opinion pieces, and organisational documents. Published between 2009 - 2024.	Published prior to 2009

230 **Table 1: Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

231

232 **Step (iv): Charting the Data**

233 A data extraction tool specific to the research questions will be developed and piloted by

234 the reviewers. Three independent reviewers will use the data extraction tool to extract and

235 record the data from the papers. The extracted data will include specific details about the

236 study participants, concepts, contexts, study methodologies, and key findings relevant to
237 the review questions.

238

239 The draft extraction tool can be viewed in Appendix 3. This will be modified and revised as
240 necessary during the process of extracting data from each of the included sources of
241 evidence. All modifications will be described in the scoping review. To reduce the possibility
242 of error or bias, two of the three reviewers will independently extract the data from each
243 source. Disagreements between the reviewers will be resolved through discussion or with
244 the involvement of an additional reviewer. In cases where essential data are lacking, the
245 authors of the respective papers will be contacted to request the required information.

246

247 **Step (v): Collating, summarizing, and reporting the results**

248 As per the JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis 2020 Guideline³⁰, the results will be presented
249 as both diagrams and tables, with a descriptive summary discussing how the results relate
250 to the review objectives and questions. The summary will also identify possible areas for
251 further research on this topic. The results will be categorized according to the key themes
252 identified and will relate back to the specific review objectives on the experiences of
253 international medical graduates in relation to postgraduate and licensing clinical
254 competency assessments.

255

256 **Step (vi): Consultation**

257 Experienced researchers will advise throughout the process including an expert in
258 assessment who is also an international medical graduate.

259

260 This protocol has been registered and published on the Open Science Framework (available
261 at: <https://osf.io/8gdm7>)

262

263 Discussion

264

265 The strengths of this study lie in the chosen methodology. The search strategy has been
266 designed to be inclusive, with searches of multiple databases, gray literature and reports
267 from the relevant medical licensing and assessment bodies. Adhering to the JBI
268 methodological framework for scoping reviews will allow for a broad exploration of the
269 research landscape. The use of the PRISMA ScR reporting guidelines will ensure
270 transparency at all stages in the reporting process.

271

272 A potential limitation of the study may be the difficulty in obtaining translations of sources
273 that are not published in the English language. However, the researchers are based in a
274 University with a large multinational faculty and global research links and every effort will
275 be made to obtain translations of all relevant sources. As with all reviews, there is the
276 potential for publication bias in the studies included. This will be considered and discussed
277 in the final review.

278

279 The findings of this scoping review will be disseminated via peer reviewed journal
280 publication and presentation at medical conferences.

281

282 This scoping review will be part of a larger piece of work which aims to explore the issues
283 and difficulties faced by international medical graduates in relation to clinical competency
284 assessment. While there are published reviews of the issues faced by IMGs in relation to
285 working and acclimatization in a new country, these do not deal specifically with issues
286 related to assessment. This work will add to the body of existing knowledge in this field. Due
287 to the large number of IMGs now staffing health services across the globe, we believe that
288 this review is timely and that it has the potential to suggest ways to improve assessment for
289 international and local medical graduates.

290

291 [Acknowledgements](#)

292 The authors acknowledge the contribution of Virginia Conrick, a librarian at University
293 College Cork, for her assistance in devising the search strategy.

294

295 **References**

296

- 297 1. Malau-Aduli BS, Smith AM, Young L, Sen Gupta T, Hays R. To stay or go? Unpacking
298 the decision-making process and coping strategies of International Medical Graduates
299 practising in rural, remote, and regional Queensland, Australia. PLoS One. 2020 Jun 1;15(6).
- 300 2. Healey SJR, Fakes K, Nair BR. Inequitable treatment as perceived by international
301 medical graduates (IMGs): a scoping review. BMJ Open. 2023 Jul 12;13(7):e071992.
- 302 3. OECD. Health at a Glance 2023 [Internet]. OECD; 2023 Nov. (Health at a Glance).
303 Available from: [https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/health-at-a-](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/health-at-a-glance-2023_7a7afb35-en)
304 [glance-2023_7a7afb35-en](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/health-at-a-glance-2023_7a7afb35-en)
- 305 4. Jenkins TM, Franklyn G, Klugman J, Reddy ST. Separate but Equal? The Sorting of
306 USMDs and Non-USMDs in Internal Medicine Residency Programs. J Gen Intern Med. 2020
307 May 10;35(5):1458–64.
- 308 5. Tyrrell E, Keegan C, Humphries N, McAleese S, Thomas S, Normand C, et al.
309 Predictors of career progression and obstacles and opportunities for non-EU hospital
310 doctors to undertake postgraduate training in Ireland. Hum Resour Health. 2016 Jun 30;14.
- 311 6. Motala MI, Van Wyk JM. Experiences of foreign medical graduates (FMGs),
312 international medical graduates (IMGs) and overseas trained graduates (OTGs) on entering
313 developing or middle-income countries like South Africa: A scoping review. Vol. 17, Human
314 Resources for Health. BioMed Central Ltd.; 2019.

- 315 7. Michalski K, Farhan N, Motschall E, Vach W, Boeker M. Dealing with foreign cultural
316 paradigms: A systematic review on intercultural challenges of international medical
317 graduates. Vol. 12, PLoS ONE. Public Library of Science; 2017.
- 318 8. Esmail A, Roberts C. Independent Review of the Membership of the Royal College of
319 General Practitioners (MRCGP) examination). 2013.
- 320 9. Tiffin PA, Illing J, Kasim AS, McLachlan JC. Annual Review of Competence Progression
321 (ARCP) performance of doctors who passed Professional and Linguistic Assessments Board
322 (PLAB) tests compared with UK medical graduates: National data linkage study. Vol. 348,
323 BMJ (Online). BMJ Publishing Group; 2014.
- 324 10. Wakeford R, Denney M, Ludka-Stempien K, Dacre J, McManus IC. Cross-comparison
325 of MRCGP & MRCP(UK) in a database linkage study of 2,284 candidates taking both
326 examinations: Assessment of validity and differential performance by ethnicity. BMC Med
327 Educ. 2015 Dec 12;15(1).
- 328 11. Woolf K, McManus IC, Potts HWW, Dacre J. The mediators of minority ethnic
329 underperformance in final medical school examinations. British Journal of Educational
330 Psychology. 2013 Mar;83(1):135–59.
- 331 12. Luton OW, Mellor K, Robinson DBT, Barber Z, James OP, Powell AGMT, et al.
332 Differential attainment in higher surgical training: scoping pan-specialty spectra. Postgrad
333 Med J. 2023 Jul 21;99(1174):849–54.
- 334 13. McManus IC, Wakeford R. PLAB and UK graduates' performance on MRCP(UK) and
335 MRCGP examinations: data linkage study. BMJ. 2014 Apr 17;348(apr16 3):g2621–g2621.

- 336 14. Pattinson J, Blow C, Sinha B, Siriwardena A. Exploring reasons for differences in
337 performance between UK and international medical graduates in the Membership of the
338 Royal College of General Practitioners Applied Knowledge Test: A cognitive interview study.
339 BMJ Open. 2019 May 1;9(5).
- 340 15. Menzies L, Minson S, Brightwell A, Davies-Muir A, Long A, Fertleman C. An evaluation
341 of demographic factors affecting performance in a paediatric membership multiple-choice
342 examination. Postgrad Med J. 2015 Feb 1;91(1072):72–6.
- 343 16. *Between: The Queen on the application of BAPIO Action Ltd. (Claimant) v Royal*
344 *College of General Practitioners (First Defendant) and General Medical Council (Second*
345 *Defendant)*. 2014.
- 346 17. MacLellan AM, Brailovsky C, Rainsberry P, Bowmer I, Desrochers M. Examination
347 outcomes for international medical graduates pursuing or completing family medicine
348 residency training in Quebec. Vol. 56, *Canadian Family Physician • Le Médecin de famille*
349 *canadien*. 2010.
- 350 18. Östgren CJ, Krook-Brandt M, Carlborg A. Internship-test reveals increased knowledge
351 gaps. *Lakartidningen*. 2016 Apr 8;113.
- 352 19. Wikaire E, Curtis E, Cormack D, Jiang Y, McMillan L, Loto R, et al. Predictors of
353 academic success for Māori, Pacific and non-Māori non-Pacific students in health
354 professional education: a quantitative analysis. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*. 2017
355 May 1;22(2):299–326.
- 356 20. Broecke Stijn, Nicholls Tom. Ethnicity and degree attainment (research report
357 RW92). 2007.

- 358 21. Woolf K, McManus IC, Potts HWW, Dacre J. The mediators of minority ethnic
359 underperformance in final medical school examinations. *British Journal of Educational*
360 *Psychology*. 2013 Mar;83(1):135–59.
- 361 22. Rasquinha M. Difficulties and educational challenges faced by international medical
362 graduates in trust grade roles in the UK. *Br J Hosp Med*. 2022 Apr 2;83(4):1–7.
- 363 23. Roe V, Patterson F, Edwards KH. “What supported your success in training?”
364 Executive Summary Background [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2023 Jun 25]. Available from:
365 [https://www.gmc-uk.org/-/media/documents/gmc-da-final-report-success-factors-in-](https://www.gmc-uk.org/-/media/documents/gmc-da-final-report-success-factors-in-training-211119_pdf-80914221.pdf)
366 [training-211119_pdf-80914221.pdf](https://www.gmc-uk.org/-/media/documents/gmc-da-final-report-success-factors-in-training-211119_pdf-80914221.pdf)
- 367 24. Miller GE. The assessment of clinical skills/competence/performance. *Academic*
368 *Medicine*. 1990;65(9):S63-67.
- 369 25. Regan De Bere S, Nunn S, Nasser M. Understanding differential attainment across
370 medical training pathways: A rapid review of the literature Final report prepared for The
371 General Medical Council. 2015.
- 372 26. Colquhoun HL, Levac D, O’Brien KK, Straus S, Tricco AC, Perrier L, et al. Scoping
373 reviews: time for clarity in definition, methods, and reporting. *J Clin Epidemiol* [Internet].
374 2014 Jul [cited 2024 Jan 13];67(12):1291–4. Available from:
375 [https://www.jclinepi.com/article/S0895-4356\(14\)00210-8/fulltext](https://www.jclinepi.com/article/S0895-4356(14)00210-8/fulltext)
- 376 27. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O’Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA
377 Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med*.
378 2018 Oct 2;169(7):467–73.

379 28. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *Int J*
380 *Soc Res Methodol*. 2005 Feb;8(1):19–32.

381 29. Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. 2010, 'Scoping studies: advancing the
382 methodology', *J* vol. 5, no. 69, pp. 1-9. *Implementation Science*. 2010;5(69):1–9.

383 30. Peters M, Godfrey C, Mclnerney P, Munn Z, Tricco A, Khalil H. Chapter 11: Scoping
384 reviews. In: *JB I Manual for Evidence Synthesis*. JBI; 2020.

385

386

387

388 **Keywords**

389 Clinical competence; differential attainment; educational measurement; emigration and
390 immigration; foreign medical graduates.

391

392 **S1: Appendix 1:**
 393 **Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for**
 394 **Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist**
 395

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	Manuscript Title – Page 1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	Abstract – Page 2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	Page 4-7
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	Page 8 - 10
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	https://osf.io/8gdm7 Page 14
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	Table 1 Page 12
Information sources*	7	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	Search strategy - Page 10
Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy	Appendix 2

		for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	
Selection of sources of evidence†	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	Page 11
Data charting process‡	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	Page 12-13
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	Data Extraction Tool – Appendix 3
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	N/A
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	Page 13
RESULTS			
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	N/A
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	N/A
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	N/A
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	N/A
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	N/A
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review	N/A

		questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	N/A
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	N/A
FUNDING			
Funding	22	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	N/A

396
397

398 JBI = Joanna Briggs Institute; PRISMA-ScR = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
399 reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews.

400 * Where *sources of evidence* (see second footnote) are compiled from, such as bibliographic
401 databases, social media platforms, and Web sites.

402 † A more inclusive/heterogeneous term used to account for the different types of evidence
403 or data sources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy
404 documents) that may be eligible in a scoping review as opposed to only studies. This is not
405 to be confused with *information sources* (see first footnote).

406 ‡ The frameworks by Arksey and O'Malley (6) and Levac and colleagues (7) and the JBI
407 guidance (4, 5) refer to the process of data extraction in a scoping review as data charting.

408 § The process of systematically examining research evidence to assess its validity, results,
409 and relevance before using it to inform a decision. This term is used for items 12 and 19
410 instead of "risk of bias" (which is more applicable to systematic reviews of interventions) to
411 include and acknowledge the various sources of evidence that may be used in a scoping
412 review (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy
413 document).

414
415 *From:* Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension
416 for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med.*
417 2018;169:467–473. [doi: 10.7326/M18-0850](https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850).

418

420 **Appendix 2: Search strategy**

421 **PubMed (National Library of Medicine)**

422 Search conducted on May 10thth, 2024.

423

Search	Query	Records retrieved
#1	"international medical graduate*" [Title/Abstract] OR "foreign medical graduate*" [Title/Abstract] OR "foreign doctor*" [Title/Abstract] OR "foreign trained physician*" [Title/Abstract] OR "foreign trained doctor*" [Title/Abstract] OR "overseas trained doctor*" [Title/Abstract] OR "overseas graduate*" [Title/Abstract] OR "Overseas Medical Graduate*" [Title/Abstract] OR "migrant physician*" [Title/Abstract] OR "migrant doctor*" [Title/Abstract] OR "immigrant doctor*" [Title/Abstract] OR "non-EU doctor*" [Title/Abstract] OR "non-EU trained*" [Title/Abstract] OR "non-UK graduate*" [Title/Abstract] OR "non-UK qualified" [Title/Abstract] OR "non-UK trained" [Title/Abstract] OR "non-US graduate*" [Title/Abstract] OR "non-US trained" [Title/Abstract] OR "refugee doctor*" [Title/Abstract]	2,220
#2	"foreign medical graduates" [MeSH Terms]	3631
#3	("clinical competenc*" [Title/Abstract] OR "licenc*" [Title/Abstract] OR licens* [Title/Abstract]) OR "accredit*" [Title/Abstract] OR "educational measurement" [Title/Abstract] OR "educational assessment" [Title/Abstract] OR Attainment [Title/Abstract] OR success* [Title/Abstract] OR fail* [Title/Abstract] OR "academic performance" [Title/Abstract] OR (((Postgraduate [Title/Abstract] OR licenc* [Title/Abstract] OR licens* [Title/Abstract]) AND (medical [Title/Abstract]) AND (assess* [Title/Abstract] OR exam* [Title/Abstract])))	2,764,181
#4	"clinical competence" OR "educational measurement" [MeSH Terms]	168,635
#5	#1 OR #2	4619
#6	#3 OR #4	2,903,826
#7	#5 AND #6	1403
#8	#7 (from 2009 – 2024)	653

424

425 This strategy used in PubMed will be revised for use with British Education Index, ERIC,

426 Psych Info, Scopus, and Soc Index.

427

428

429 **S3: Appendix 3**

430 **Data Extraction Tool (Continued on next page)**

431

Scoping Review Details	
Scoping Review title:	International medical graduates’ experiences of clinical competency assessment in postgraduate and licensing examinations: a scoping review protocol
Review objective/s:	The objective of this scoping review is to examine the major themes in academic and gray literature relating to international medical graduates’ experiences of clinical competency assessment; and to identify the gaps in our knowledge on this topic.
Review question/s:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What literature has been published relating to the experiences of international medical graduates undertaking clinical postgraduate and licensing medical examinations? 2. What experiences do international medical graduates describe in relation to clinical postgraduate and licensing medical examinations? 3. What are the gaps in the literature relating to our knowledge and understanding of international medical graduates’ experiences of clinical postgraduate and licensing medical examinations?
Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria	
Population	International medical graduates
Concept	Experiences of clinical competency assessment
Context	Postgraduate or licensing or credentialing medical assessment designed to measure clinical competence
Types of evidence source	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative or mixed methods studies, ‘gray’ literature such as reports, reviews, theses, letters, book chapters, opinion pieces, and organisational documents • Published between 2009 - 2024.
Evidence source Details and Characteristics	
Citation details (e.g., author/s, date, title, journal, volume, issue, pages)	
Country	
Context	
Participants (details e.g., age/sex and number)	
Details/Results extracted from source of evidence (in relation to the concept of the scoping review)	
Experiences described by IMGs in relation to assessment	
IMG’s views on their assessments / outcomes	
Data published by postgraduate training bodies relating to IMGs and	

assessment	
Data published by medical licensing organisations relating to IMGs and assessment	
Recommendations published by postgraduate training bodies relating to IMGs and assessment	
Recommendations published by medical licensing organisations relating to IMGs and assessment	

