

1 **Silence in physician clinical practice: a scoping review protocol**

2

3 Martina Ann Kelly¹, Stefanie Rivera¹, Caitlin McClurg², Catherine Sweeney³, Stephen Mosca⁴,

4 Ellen McLeod⁵, Deirdre Bennett², Megan Brown⁶

5

6 ¹Department of Family Medicine, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary,

7 Calgary, Alberta, Canada

8 ²Libraries and Cultural Resources, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

9 ³Medical Education Unit, Brookfield Health Sciences Complex, University College Cork, Cork,

10 Ireland

11 ⁴Division of Palliative Care, University of British Columbia, Canada

12 ⁵Division of Palliative Care, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

13 ⁶School of Medicine, Newcastle University, Newcastle, United Kingdom

14

15 **Corresponding author:** Catherine Sweeney. ORCID 0000-0002-2073-9457

16 **Address:** School of Medicine, Brookfield Health Sciences Complex, University College Cork,

17 Cork, Ireland

18 **Email:** C.Sweeney@ucc.ie

19

20

21 **Abstract**

22 **Objective**

23 The objective of this review is to map, describe and conceptualize how silence is discussed
24 within literature on interactions between physicians and patients, in clinical settings.

25

26 **Methods**

27 We will use the methodological framework of Arksey & O'Malley, adapted by Levac et al and
28 Joanna Briggs Institute. Empirical studies including quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods,
29 observational studies and reviews will be included. Commentaries, editorials, and grey literature
30 will also be examined. The databases MEDLINE, Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied
31 Health Literature, PsycINFO, Scopus and Web of Science will be searched. A two-part study
32 selection strategy will be applied. First, reviewers will follow inclusion and exclusion criteria
33 based on 'Population-Concept-Context' framework to independently screen titles and abstracts.
34 Next, full texts will be screened. Data will be extracted, collated, and charted to summarize
35 methods, outcomes and key findings from the articles included.

36

37 **Expected results and implications**

38 This scoping review will provide an extensive description of how physicians engage with silence
39 in clinical settings. Findings will identify how silence is perceived in physician patient
40 interactions, the roles it plays, what factors influence use of silence and guide development of
41 educational initiatives on use of silence in clinical settings.

42

43 **Keywords:** silence, communication, non-verbal communication, scoping review

44 **Introduction**

45 Effective use, and interpretation, of silence is a sophisticated and essential communication skill.¹
46 Proficient use of silence is associated with enhanced empathy, understanding, thoughtfulness,
47 and self-awareness,^{1, 2} essential for good medical practice.^{3, 4} Despite this, research into silence in
48 healthcare communication is lacking and the topic is poorly covered in communication skills
49 curricula.^{5, 6} Having an in-depth understanding of physicians' use, and experiences of, silence,
50 could apprise communication skills training to enhance good doctor-patient communication.

51
52 Silence is not merely the absence of verbal communication, but rather silence and speech organize
53 each other, forming a continuum.^{7, 8} Silence in clinical contexts is defined as an absence of verbal
54 audio signal, lasting longer than required to take turns to speak (2 seconds).⁹ The meaning of
55 silence is impacted by the context, ambient sounds, utterances before and after the silence. Silence
56 is also configured through non-verbal cues such as eye contact, gestures, movement, posture, and
57 paralinguistic communication.¹⁰⁻¹² Culture also plays a role in silence. For example, in Asian
58 contexts silence can be a sign of respect and is also acknowledged as being full of meaning. In
59 contrast, in Western cultures, especially North America, silence can be perceived more negatively,
60 as a sign of unfriendliness or not being worthy – we must 'add' something to the conversation.¹³

61
62 Silence can play many roles in a consultation. In day-to-day language, silence, as expressed
63 through pauses, is used to organize speech, such as turn-taking. For example, a physician may
64 pause to invite a response, giving a participant a moment to gather their thoughts and think a bit
65 longer about the subject matter. Silence can also afford emotional acknowledgement, for example
66 following a moment of gravity. Silence can be non-productive, as in awkward silences, when the

67 information being communicated is ambiguous or poorly understood. An awkward silence can
68 also arise in the context of uncertainty, or distraction/ inattention. Non-productive silence can also
69 be hostile, as in the withholding of information or judgement – a ‘conspiracy of silence’, or to
70 prevent the sharing of anxiety. To date, several authors have attempted to characterize silence,
71 using different terms such as compassionate silence,^{14, 15} connectional silence,^{9, 15} profound
72 silence¹⁶ and awkward silence.¹⁴

73
74 Despite its significance, silence as a focus of research in healthcare is relatively limited, primarily
75 originating from psychotherapy or palliative care.^{14, 17} A 2008 meta-ethnography of silence
76 identified 18 studies, of which only 4 were empirical studies, the remainder consisting of opinion
77 pieces, or commentaries.¹⁷ This review identified that studies drew on literature from psychology,
78 communication, and spiritual traditions. More recently, researchers in oncology and palliative care
79 have audio recorded consultations documenting the epidemiology of silence, coding for frequency
80 of silence, duration, and several authors propose varying typologies of silence, often related to the
81 duration and purpose of the pause.^{9, 14, 18, 19} However, the relationship between silence, nonverbal
82 cues, and verbal communication, and how they influence each other, remains unclear. This scoping
83 review seeks to address this research gap by examining how silence is described and
84 conceptualized in the clinical literature. This protocol delineates the procedures for conducting the
85 review, guided by good practice and protocols for scoping review development.²⁰

86
87 The primary objective of this review is to identify, analyze and synthesize how silence is
88 engaged in interactions between physicians (including physicians in training) and patients, in the

89 clinical setting. This information will, we anticipate, be useful to enhance doctor-patient
90 interactions through communication skills training.

91

92 Review questions:

93 1. How is silence conceptualized in the clinical literature involving doctors and patients?

94 2. What roles / functions does silence play in physician-patient communication?

95

96 **Methods**

97 We chose to conduct a scoping review given the breadth of ways in which silence can be
98 engaged. Scoping reviews are well suited to answer broad and exploratory research questions.
99 They are used to explore new research areas, to clarify key concepts and identify research gaps
100 by mapping the literary landscape, elucidating methodologies, core concepts, evidence types, and
101 characteristics.²¹ They frequently unveil a wider spectrum of evidence, serving as a foundation
102 for systematic reviews and pinpointing knowledge voids.^{20, 21} This protocol has been reported
103 using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses extension for
104 systematic review protocols (PRISMA-P)²² (S1 Appendix).

105

106 **Methodological Framework**

107 Our scoping review will follow the Arksey and O'Malley framework for scoping reviews,²³
108 adapted by Levac et al.²⁴ and the Joanna Briggs Institute.²⁵ Components will include: identifying
109 a research question; identifying relevant studies; study selection; charting data; collating,
110 summarizing, and reporting results; and consultation. The findings of the review will be

111 presented following the guidelines of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and
112 Meta-analyses extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR).²⁶

113

114 **Stage 1: Identifying the research question**

115 We used the Population Concept Context framework (PCC), recommended by the Joanna Briggs
116 Institute for scoping reviews to develop our review question.²⁵ The population are physicians
117 and patients, the concept is the experience of silence in professional caregiving interactions with
118 physicians and patients, and the context is clinical settings. Our review question is ‘how is
119 silence conceptualized in clinical literature involving doctors and patients?’ This question may
120 be refined, or new ones added, as the authors gain increasing familiarity with the literature.

121

122 **Stage 2 Identifying relevant studies**

123 *Types of Sources.* Empirical research on silence encompassing various study designs will be
124 considered, including qualitative studies, observational studies, surveys and questionnaires,
125 longitudinal studies, meta-analyses or evidence synthesis, and conversational analysis. We will
126 also include commentaries, personal reflections and grey literature sources (conference
127 proceedings, abstracts, thesis etc). Only English-language sources will be included due to
128 feasibility and translation issues, with no restrictions on publication dates.

129

130 Table 1 Inclusion and exclusion criteria according to the PCC framework

	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Population	Physicians, ranging from general	Other healthcare professionals, such

	<p>practitioners to specialists, resident physicians, and medical students.</p>	<p>as Professional Nurses, Registered Nurses, Enrolled Nurses, Nurse Aides, Nursing Students, Dentists, Pharmacists, Nutritionists, EMTs, and Medical Laboratory Technologists. Additionally, Professional Therapists, Clinical Psychologists, Counseling Psychologists, as well as Professional Pastors and Spiritual Counselors</p>
<p>Concept</p>	<p>The role of silences in professional caregiving interactions with patients and clients.</p> <p>This involves analyzing how silence is used in clinical settings and communication skills curricula.</p> <p>These roles encompass silence in communication, verbal and non-verbal, as well as the concept of the "conspiracy of silence," where silence is wielded as a tool for power or control</p>	<p>Silence in religious contexts</p> <p>Silence-external to human interaction e.g. nature</p> <p>Silence in relation to hearing impairment</p>
<p>Context</p>	<p>Clinical settings, such as hospitals,</p>	<p>Academic environments such</p>

	clinics, physician's offices, urgent care centers, nursing homes, long-term care facilities, rehabilitation centers, mental health clinics, palliative care units, and home care environments Telemedicine	classroom, simulations, lectures etc.
--	---	---------------------------------------

131

132

133 A preliminary search was conducted on Google Scholar to gain an overview of existing literature
 134 and identify seed studies. Text word from titles, and abstracts of seed papers, along with the
 135 MeSH-terms from MEDLINE were tailored to develop an initial search strategy for MEDLINE
 136 (table 1). Comprehensive searches will be carried out in the following databases: Scopus, Web of
 137 Science, CINAHL Plus with Full Text, APA PsychINFO, and MEDLINE. Reference lists of
 138 included studies will undergo screening to identify any additional relevant studies. The search
 139 strategy will be adapted for each database and further refined in consultation with a research
 140 librarian (CmC).

141

142 Table 2 Search strategy terms for MEDLINE (PubMed)

143

	MeSH terms	Related terms
Population	exp Education, Medical/	provider*.tw,kf. clinician*.tw,kf.

	exp "Internship and Residency"/ exp Faculty, Medical/ exp Physician-Patient Relations/	trainee*.tw,kf. residen*.tw,kf. interns*.tw,kf. preceptor*.tw,kf. physician*.tw,kf. doctor*.tw,kf.
Concept	exp Communication exp Mindfulness exp Voice exp Social Isolation/ or exp Loneliness/ exp Interpersonal Relations	silence*.tw,kf. discuss*.tw,kf. ,support*.tw,kf., relation*.tw,kf. connect*.tw,kf., communicat*.tw,kf., convers*.tw,kf., interact*.tw,kf., contemplat*.tw,kf., acknowledg*.tw,kf. peace*.tw,kf., hope*.tw,kf. paus*.tw,kf., mindful*.tw,kf. awkward*.tw,kf., grie*.tw,kf. stigma*.tw,kf., violen*.tw,kf., abus*.tw,kf solitude.tw,kf., still*.tw,kf.,tranquil*.tw,kf
Context	exp Telemedicine/ exp Videoconferencing/ exp Remote Consultation/	(telehealth* or teleconsult* or teleconf* or virtual care or zoom* or skype*).mp

144

145

146 **Stage 3: Study Selection**

147 After completing the search, all located records will be uploaded to Covidence systemic review
148 software (Veritas Health Innovation) and duplicates removed. A pilot test will be performed on a
149 random subset of 50 titles/abstracts to refine the inclusion/exclusion criteria, if necessary, and to
150 ensure consistent application of selection criteria among reviewers.

151
152 Screening will take place in 2 phases. All citations will be screened independently by 2
153 reviewers, based on title and abstract. Any discrepancies that arise during each stage of the
154 selection process will be resolved by consulting a third reviewer. Next full texts will be imported
155 into Covidence and reviewed by 2 independent reviewers. Reasons for exclusion will be
156 documented. Findings of the search and the study inclusion process will be comprehensively
157 reported in the final scoping review, following the reporting guidelines outlined in the Preferred
158 Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses Extension for Scoping Reviews
159 (PRISMA-ScR).²⁶

160

161 **Stage 4: Charting the data**

162 Information drawn from each publication will encompass details such as authorship and year of
163 publication, location, and study methodology. Additionally, particulars about the study
164 population, concept, context, and pertinent findings relevant to the review question. A
165 preliminary version of the data extraction tool is provided in Table 3.

166

167 Table 3. Preliminary Data Extraction Tool

168

Categories	Questions
Publication Details	
Author(s)	Who are the authors of the publication?
Year of Publication	When was it published
Country of origin	Where was the study carried out?
General Overview of Study	
Objective and aims	What was the objective and aims of the study?
Methods	What methods (e.g. qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods) were used?
	How were patients and/or physicians engaged in the design process?
Population	Who were the participants, sample size?
Concept	What type of data concerning silence was included?
	In what manner is silence described, and characterized including the terms used, such as invitational, hostile, etc.?
	What, if any factors influence engaging with silence
Context	In what setting did the employment of silence take place?

Findings/results	What are the roles, purposes, or functions of silence?
	Any challenges/limitations reported?

169

170

171 Before the extraction process, the team will collaborate to pilot five of the included studies to
172 confirm accuracy, ensure mutual comprehension, and assess the suitability of the data extraction
173 form. Modifications to the data extraction form will be made as necessary and additional
174 categories may be identified during data extraction. Any modifications made to the tool will be
175 carefully noted and disclosed as part of our audit trail. In instances where essential data for
176 extraction is not readily available within the published paper, authors of the respective
177 publications will be contacted for clarification.

178

179 **Stage 5: Collating, summarizing and reporting the results**

180 Scoping reviews, differing from systematic reviews, generally do not evaluate the
181 methodological quality or bias risk of the studies included, nor do they perform data synthesis
182 like meta-analyses. Instead, they offer a descriptive overview of the studies encompassed.²⁰ Our
183 approach involves both numerical and narrative summarization of various aspects of the included
184 studies. These aspects include the year of publication, geographical location, clinical setting,
185 participants, and study design. This analysis aims to map how silence is described in clinical
186 interactions between patients and physicians.

187 Qualitative data will be analyzed using thematic analysis.²⁷This will involve coding extracted
188 data and grouping it iteratively to identify patterns of shared meaning in the data extracted. This
189 will be complimented by drawing on our experiences as author group of family physicians (MK,

190 CS, DB), palliative care doctors (SM, EmL) and medical educationalists (MB) working across
191 different health contexts. We anticipate the need for regular team meetings to facilitate data
192 charting and analysis.²⁴

193

194 **Stage 6: Consultation**

195 In line with Levac et al.'s recommendation, we will integrate consultation as a component of our
196 planned scoping review.²⁴ The outcomes of this review will be shared through presentations to
197 palliative care physicians, ensuring a comprehensive exploration and understanding of silence's
198 role in clinical healthcare settings. This consultation phase will gather insights into our initial
199 findings and their significance, explore potential applications and dissemination strategies, and
200 identify areas requiring further research. Through this collaborative approach, we will facilitate
201 discussions on implications and practical insights e.g. to improve communication skills training.
202 Engaging in conversations with physicians will offer valuable insights into the practical
203 implications of the research, enriching our skill set by incorporating diverse perspectives into the
204 research process.

205

206 **Limitations**

207 Whilst we will do our best to identify all relevant literature, it may be that our search strategy
208 may miss some studies. Additionally, our search is restricted to English language studies across 5
209 databases. This protocol is restricted to physicians and physicians in training. Whilst
210 understanding silence across health care professionals would be informative, the decision to
211 restrict our search to physicians is based on a mix of pragmatic limitations and to focus our

212 findings relative to our expertise in medical education. We anticipate study heterogeneity, which
213 may limit the type of analysis possible.

214

215 **Discussion**

216 This protocol presents the methodological framework and approach we will employ to identify
217 and map the existing evidence regarding the experiences of physicians with silence in clinical
218 settings. By identifying, analyzing, and synthesizing existing literature on this topic, the review
219 will offer insights into the various roles and functions of silence in physician-patient interactions.

220 The review will help recognize the diverse roles that silence plays in clinical consultations.

221 These roles encompass diverse aspects such as invitational silence, emotional acknowledgment,

222 non-productive silence, and hostile silence, among others. Understanding these roles holds the

223 potential to enhance the communication skills of healthcare professionals, enriching patient care

224 experiences, improving their quality of life, and fostering a safe and comfortable environment

225 within healthcare settings. Such insights can inform the development of tailored educational

226 initiatives aimed at augmenting physicians' proficiency in communication. Through

227 dissemination via peer-reviewed presentations and publications, the findings of this scoping

228 review will contribute to ongoing dialogues on optimizing doctor-patient communication and

229 refining healthcare delivery practices.

230

231 **Authors' contributions:** Conceptualization: MK, SR, MB, CS, Methodology: all, Writing: MK

232 and SR wrote the initial draft, this was reviewed and edited by all members of the team, who

233 approved submission of the final protocol.

234

235 **Supporting Information:** PRISMA-P

236

237 **Data Availability Statement:** No datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

238 All relevant data from this study will be made available upon study completion.

239

240 **Funding:** The authors received no specific funding for this research.

241

242 **Competing interests:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

243

244 **References**

245 1. Kenny C. *The Power of Silence: Silent Communication in Daily Life*. Abingdon, Oxon:

246 Routledge; 2011.

247 2. Ruiz-Moral R, de Leonardo CG, Martínez FC, Martín DM. Medical students' perceptions

248 towards learning communication skills: a qualitative study following the 2-year training

249 programme. *Int J Med Educ*. 2019;10:90.

250 3. Association of American Medical Colleges. *Learning Objectives for Medical Student*

251 *Education: Guidelines for Medical Schools (Report 1)*. 1998. [cited June 4, 2024].

252 Available from: https://store.aamc.org/downloadable/download/sample/sample_id/144/.

253 4. General Medical Council. *Outcomes for Graduates 2018*. 2018. [cited June 4, 2024].

254 Available from: [https://www.gmc-uk.org/-/media/documents/dc11326-outcomes-for-](https://www.gmc-uk.org/-/media/documents/dc11326-outcomes-for-graduates-2018_pdf-75040796.pdf)

255 [graduates-2018_pdf-75040796.pdf](https://www.gmc-uk.org/-/media/documents/dc11326-outcomes-for-graduates-2018_pdf-75040796.pdf).

- 256 5. Lee SS. Has medical education killed “silence”? *Med Teach*. 2017;39(4):444-5.
- 257 6. Lingard L. Language matters: towards an understanding of silence and humour in
258 medical education. *Med Educ*. 2013;47(1):40-8.
- 259 7. Ephratt M. The functions of silence. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 2008;40(11):1909-38.
- 260 8. Mazzei LA. Toward a problematic of silence in action research. *Educ Action Res*.
261 2007;15(4):631-42.
- 262 9. Bartels J, Rodenbach R, Ciesinski K, Gramling R, Fiscella K, Epstein R. Eloquent
263 silences: A musical and lexical analysis of conversation between oncologists and their
264 patients. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2016;99(10):1584-94.
- 265 10. Bao D. Exploring How Silence Communicates. *English Language Teaching Educational*
266 *Journal*. 2020;3(1):1-13.
- 267 11. Hall JA, Harrigan JA, Rosenthal R. Nonverbal behavior in clinician—patient interaction.
268 *Applied and preventive psychology*. 1995;4(1):21-37.
- 269 12. Patel S, Pelletier-Bui A, Smith S, Roberts MB, Kilgannon H, Trzeciak S, et al. Curricula
270 for empathy and compassion training in medical education: a systematic review. *PLoS*
271 *One*. 2019;14(8):e0221412.

- 272 13. Johannesen RL. The Functions of Silence: A plea for communication research. *Western*
273 *Journal of Communication (includes Communication Reports)*. 1974;38(1):25-35.
- 274 14. Back AL, Bauer-Wu SM, Rushton CH, Halifax J. Compassionate silence in the patient–
275 clinician encounter: a contemplative approach. *J Palliat Med*. 2009;12(12):1113-7.
- 276 15. Gramling CJ. A Case Study of Conversation Surrounding a Compassionate Silence
277 [Internet]. Vermont Conversation Lab; 2019 [cited 2024 June 4]. Available from:
278 [https://vermontconversationlab.com/a-case-study-of-conversation-surrounding-a-](https://vermontconversationlab.com/a-case-study-of-conversation-surrounding-a-compassionate-silence/)
279 [compassionate-silence/](https://vermontconversationlab.com/a-case-study-of-conversation-surrounding-a-compassionate-silence/).
- 280 16. Rockwell SL, Woods CL, Lemmon ME, Baker JN, Mack JW, Andes KL, et al. Silence in
281 Conversations About Advancing Pediatric Cancer. *Front Oncol*. 2022;12:894586.
- 282 17. Bassett L, Bingley AF, Brearley SG. Silence as an element of care: A meta-ethnographic
283 review of professional caregivers’ experience in clinical and pastoral settings. *Palliat*
284 *Med*. 2018;32(1):185-94.
- 285 18. Durieux BN, Gramling CJ, Manukyan V, Eppstein MJ, Rizzo DM, Ross LM, et al.
286 Identifying connectional silence in palliative care consultations: a tandem machine-
287 learning and human coding method. *J Palliat Med*. 2018;21(12):1755-60.

- 288 19. Gramling CJ, Durieux BN, Clarfeld LA, Javed A, Matt JE, Manukyan V, et al.
289 Epidemiology of Connectional Silence in specialist serious illness conversations. *Patient*
290 *Educ Couns.* 2022;105(7):2005-11.
- 291 20. Peters MD, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Khalil H, Larsen P, Marnie C, et al. Best practice
292 guidance and reporting items for the development of scoping review protocols. *JBI*
293 *evidence synthesis.* 2022;20(4):953-68.
- 294 21. Munn Z, Peters MD, Stern C, Tufanaru C, McArthur A, Aromataris E. Systematic review
295 or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping
296 review approach. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2018;18:1-7.
- 297 22. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred
298 reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015
299 statement. *Systematic reviews.* 2015;4:1-9.
- 300 23. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework.
301 *International Journal of Social research Methodology.* 2005;8(1):19-32.
302 10.1080/136466702000119616.
- 303 24. Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the methodology.
304 *Implementation science.* 2010;5(1):1-9. 10.1186/1748-5908-5-69.

- 305 25. Peters M, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Soares CB, Khalil H, Parker D. Methodology for JBI
306 Scoping Reviews. *The Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewers' Manual 2015*. Adelaide,
307 Australia: Australia, JBI; 2015. p. 24.
- 308 26. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA
309 extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): checklist and explanation. *Ann Intern*
310 *Med*. 2018;169(7):467-73. 10.7326/M18-0850.
- 311 27. Braun V, Clarke V. Thematic analysis: A practical guide. London: SAGE Publishing Ltd;
312 2021. 376 p.
313