

# Instructor versus peer-led debriefing in simulation-based interprofessional education in undergraduate health professions students

<b>Submission date</b> 12/11/2025	<b>Recruitment status</b> Not yet recruiting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered <input type="checkbox"/> Protocol
<b>Registration date</b> 16/11/2025	<b>Overall study status</b> Ongoing	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan <input type="checkbox"/> Results
<b>Last Edited</b> 18/11/2025	<b>Condition category</b> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Record updated in last year

## Plain English summary of protocol

### Background and study aims

Healthcare students often train together using realistic simulations to learn how to work as a team. After these simulations, a discussion called “debriefing” helps students reflect and improve. Traditionally, these debriefings are led by instructors, which is considered the best approach but requires a lot of staff and resources. This study will explore whether debriefings led by students themselves (peer-led) can be as effective as instructor-led sessions. The goal is to compare the quality of the two methods and see how they affect teamwork skills and professional identity.

### Who can participate?

Senior students from health-related colleges in Qatar who are 18 years or older, speak English, and have completed at least one clinical placement.

### What does the study involve?

Participants will take part in a full simulation experience, including a briefing before the simulation, the simulation itself, and then a debriefing session. After the simulation, participants will be randomly assigned to either an instructor-led or peer-led debriefing group. They will also complete questionnaires about their experience and learning.

### What are the possible benefits and risks of participating?

Benefits include gaining experience in realistic clinical scenarios, improving teamwork skills, and contributing to research that could improve healthcare education. Risks are minimal and mainly involve the time commitment required for the simulation and surveys.

### Where is the study run from?

The study will take place at the Tamayuz Simulation Center at Qatar University.

### When is the study starting and how long is it expected to run for?

January 2026 to December 2026

Who is funding the study?

The study is funded by internal grants from Qatar University (QUCG-CPH-25/26-826)

Who is the main contact?

Dr Alla El-Awaisi, elawaisi@qu.edu.qa

## Contact information

### Type(s)

Principal investigator

### Contact name

Dr Alla El-Awaisi

### ORCID ID

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7930-3351>

### Contact details

Qatar

Doha

Qatar

2713

+974 4403 5599

elawaisi@qu.edu.qa

### Type(s)

Public, Scientific

### Contact name

Miss Dana Mustafa

### ORCID ID

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5771-2218>

### Contact details

Qatar

Doha

Qatar

2713

+974 4403 5657

dana.nizar@qu.edu.qa

## Additional identifiers

### Protocol serial number

QUCG-CPH-25/26-826

## Study information

**Scientific Title**

Peer-led versus instructor-led debriefing in simulation-based interprofessional education (Sim-IPE): a single-centre, parallel-group, non-inferiority randomised controlled trial.

**Acronym**

Sim-IPE

**Study objectives**

Primary: Determine whether PL debriefing is non-inferior to IL debriefing in perceived debriefing quality among students using DASH-S immediately post-debriefing.

Secondary:

1. To compare the perceived quality of PL versus IL debriefing from the perspective of student and instructor debriefers using the DASH–Instructor Version (DASH-I) tool.
2. To compare students' satisfaction with the simulation and debriefing experience following PL versus IL debriefing using the Satisfaction with Simulation Experience (SSE) tool.
3. To compare the overall team performance based on interprofessional competencies after PL versus IL debriefing, as perceived by students and debriefers, using the Modified McMaster Ottawa scale for teams (MMOS-T).
4. To compare individual students' performance within a team based on interprofessional competencies after PL versus IL debriefing, as perceived by debriefers, using the Modified McMaster Ottawa scale for individuals (MMOS-I).
5. To compare changes in students' interprofessional identity before simulation and following PL debriefing versus IL debriefing, using the Extended Professional Identity scale (EPIS).

**Ethics approval required**

Ethics approval required

**Ethics approval(s)**

submitted 22/10/2025, IRBNet (Qatar, Doha, 2713, Qatar; +974 4403 7906; qu-irb@qu.edu.qa), ref: QU-IRB 237/2025-EA

**Primary study design**

Interventional

**Allocation**

Randomized controlled trial

**Masking**

Open (masking not used)

**Control**

Active

**Assignment**

Single

**Purpose**

Education

**Study type(s)**

Efficacy

## **Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied**

Debriefing, debriefing frameworks

## **Interventions**

Peer-led (PL) post-simulation debriefing (intervention): Peer-led post-simulation debriefing involves a facilitated discussion between two or more peers in which participants review and reflect on their performance to gain insights, enhance learning outcomes, and improve future performance.

Instructor-led (IL) post-simulation debriefing (Comparison): Instructor-led post-simulation debriefing involves a facilitated discussion between participants and instructors in which participants review and reflect on their performance to gain insights, enhance learning outcomes, and improve future performance.

The duration of intervention and debriefing for both study arms is around 90 minutes.

After debriefing, students and debriefers will solve some questionnaires. There will be no follow-up for either study arm, and the intervention will only last for one day. Participants will be voluntarily invited to participate in an interview/focus group discussion afterwards.

The randomization process will be conducted through a computerized randomization tool, and the codes for group assignments will be given to students in sealed envelopes.

## **Intervention Type**

Behavioural

## **Primary outcome(s)**

1. The quality of debriefing in both comparative arms measured using both debriefers and students using the Debriefing Assessment for Simulation in Healthcare (DASH) Instructor version and the DASH student version, respectively at immediately after the intervention (after debriefing)

Quality of debriefing: The quality of debriefing in both comparative arms will be measured by both debriefers and students using the Debriefing Assessment for Simulation in Healthcare (DASH) Instructor version and the DASH student version, respectively.

Time Frame: Immediately after the intervention (after debriefing)

## **Key secondary outcome(s)**

1. Student satisfaction with the simulation and debriefing measured using the Satisfaction with Simulation Experience tool (SSE) at immediately after the intervention (after debriefing)

2. Changes in students' interprofessional identity measured using the Extended Professional Identity scale (EPIS) at pre-intervention and immediately after the intervention (before simulation and after debriefing).

3. Students' interprofessional competencies as perceived by students and instructors measured using measured using the Modified McMaster Ottawa scale for individuals and teams at immediately after the intervention (after debriefing)

1. Student satisfaction with the simulation and debriefing will be measured using the Satisfaction with Simulation Experience tool (SSE) immediately after the intervention (after debriefing).
2. Changes in students' interprofessional identity before the simulation and following debriefing in both arms will be measured using the Extended Professional Identity scale (EPIS). It will be administered pre-intervention and immediately after the intervention (before simulation and after debriefing).
3. Students' interprofessional competencies after PL versus IL debriefing, as perceived by students and instructors, will be measured using the Modified McMaster Ottawa scale for individuals and teams immediately after the intervention (after debriefing).

**Completion date**

31/12/2026

## Eligibility

**Key inclusion criteria**

1. Senior health profession students
2. Aged 18 years or older
3. From health colleges across Qatar
4. Have completed at least one clinical placement
5. Able to speak English

Participants include:

- Medical students from Qatar University (QU) who are in their fourth, fifth, or sixth year of study
- Pharmacy students from QU who are in their fourth or fifth year of study
- Nursing students from QU who are in their third or fourth year of study
- Physical therapy students from QU who are in their third or fourth year of study

**Participant type(s)**

Healthy volunteer, Learner/student

**Healthy volunteers allowed**

Yes

**Age group**

Mixed

**Lower age limit**

18 years

**Upper age limit**

99 years

**Sex**

All

**Total final enrolment**

0

**Key exclusion criteria**

1. Students from non-health colleges or universities
2. Under 18 years of age

**Date of first enrolment**

01/01/2026

**Date of final enrolment**

31/12/2026

**Locations****Countries of recruitment**

Qatar

**Study participating centre**

Qatar University Simulation Center (Tamayuz)

Qatar

Doha

Qatar

2713

**Sponsor information****Organisation**

Qatar University

**Funder(s)****Funder type**

Not defined

**Funder Name**

Qatar University

**Alternative Name(s)**

QU

**Funding Body Type**

Government organisation

**Funding Body Subtype**

Local government

**Location**

Qatar

## **Results and Publications**

**Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan**

**IPD sharing plan summary**

Not expected to be made available