

## Review report

Final title: **Pedagogy of community-engaged research**

Title at submission: Pedagogy of community-engaged research



OPEN ACCESS

### Correspondence

Tanvir C Turin  
[turin.chowdhury@ucalgary.ca](mailto:turin.chowdhury@ucalgary.ca)

### Publication history

Received: 15 Sep 2025  
Accepted: 16 Oct 2025  
Published online: 30 Oct 2025

### Executive editor

M Mostafa Zaman  
0000-0002-1736-1342

### Reviewers

B: Md Rasel Ahmad  
0009-0009-2936-0169  
C: Shafinaz Gazi  
0000-0001-5157-3835

### Keywords

*pedagogy, community-engaged research, participatory, experiential learning, teaching methods*

### Ethical approval

Not applicable

### Funding

None

### Trial registration number

Not applicable

**Reviewer: B: Md Rasel Ahmad**, ORCID: [0009-0009-2936-0169](https://orcid.org/0009-0009-2936-0169)

**1. Comment** In Abstract: The framework is proposed but not tested or validated through case studies, pilot programs, or comparative analysis. There is no clear strategy for evaluating the effectiveness of the teaching–learning practices. While institutional constraints are acknowledged, the abstract does not explain how the model could be embedded into existing curricula or overcome resistance from rigid academic structures. It lacks detail on how community partners participate in shaping the pedagogy itself, not just in research. While comprehensive in theory, the framework risks remaining too conceptual without concrete tools, syllabi, or teaching resources.

**Response** Thank you for your detailed and thoughtful feedback. We greatly appreciate your recognition of the importance of this work. We would like to clarify that this manuscript is a methodology conceptual paper, designed to lay the conceivable foundational framework for CEnR pedagogy. As such, it does not present empirical testing, case studies, pilot programs, or comparative analysis, which are indeed important next steps but fall beyond the scope of this initial conceptual work. We recognise that the points raised regarding evaluation strategies, community co-design, and practical implementation are important. However, adding these elements at this stage would be premature, as they require systematic research, piloting, and iterative refinement. The current manuscript focuses on articulating the conceptual foundations, design principles, and teaching–learning practices that underpin a learner-centered, transformative CEnR pedagogy. In alignment with the reviewer's suggestions, we are indeed embarking on further research to test, refine, and operationalize this framework, including case studies, pilot programs, and evaluation strategies. This future work will allow us to translate the conceptual model into concrete, evidence-based practices while preserving the integrity and values of CEnR. We hope this explanation clarifies the scope of the manuscript and underscores our commitment to advancing CEnR pedagogy through a phased, evidence-informed approach.

**2. Comment** The term 'lite pedagogy' is mentioned as a risk, but the abstract does not outline safeguards against it.

**Response** Thank you for the excellent suggestion. We have added the following in the revised manuscript to address that (page 4 lines 77-79).  
“Safeguards against such superficial adoption include structured mentorship, reflective assessment checkpoints, and co-teaching arrangements that center community voices”.

**3. Comment** Pedagogy of CEnR Section: The section describes what CEnR pedagogy should include but does not provide examples of tested models, case studies, or measurable learning outcomes. While the framework highlights values, strategies, and practices, it does not detail how success will be evaluated. The framework is presented as general, but it does not consider how pedagogy may need to shift across disciplines, institutions, or cultural/geopolitical contexts.

Teaching–Learning Practices: While reflexive journals, peer feedback, and co-designed rubrics are mentioned, there is no detail on how reliability and rigor in assessment will be maintained. The section frames community members as co-teachers and evaluators but does not explain how their involvement will be supported or compensated. Reflexivity and accountability are emphasized, yet no indicators or metrics are proposed to measure growth in these relational dimensions.

Circumstantial Realities and Challenges: No strategies are offered for negotiating with institutional structures, faculty resistance, or resource limitations. The section does not describe what stages of development look like in practice, or how learners transition between them. Transformative justice is mentioned, but the text does not articulate how principles of equity, power redistribution, or decolonial approaches can be embedded structurally in pedagogy.

**Response** As already acknowledged above, while we fully recognise the value of including concrete tools, case studies, or metrics for evaluating effectiveness, we believe that such work constitutes a subsequent, empirically driven phase of research that will require careful co-design with community partners and rigorous pilot testing. Including these prematurely would risk conflating conceptual framing with implementation details, potentially diluting the theoretical clarity and methodological focus of this paper.

Regarding community partner participation, we have highlighted their role as contributors to pedagogy, but the specific modalities of engagement and co-design will be investigated and reported in future applied studies. Similarly, strategies for embedding the framework into diverse institutional contexts, negotiating faculty resistance, and developing assessment indicators are recognized as important next steps that will follow after establishing the conceptual foundation.

This paper conceptualizes multilevel pedagogical model for CEnR as a basis for future empirical work. We hope the reviewer appreciates that the current scope is intentionally focused on conceptual development, which is essential before embarking on applied investigations of tools, curricula, and evaluation measures.

In the light of your comments, we made several changes in the revised version of the manuscript.

Please see the revised version –  
Page 3 lines 60-64  
Page 4 lines 77-79  
Page 7 lines 150-152  
Page 11 lines 246-250

**Reviewer: C: Shafinaz Gazi**, ORCID: [0000-0001-5157-3835](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5157-3835)

**4. Comment** The article addresses an issue that is both contemporary and important in the field of medical education, and the overall writing is excellent. However, as this is a methodology article, the methods presented must be more precise and focused throughout. Furthermore, the table and figure require substantial visual improvement to meet publication standards. Specifically:

- Table: Since the table merely lists the components of pedagogy, a single column is sufficient and would be clearer.
- Figure: The title, "Pedagogy of CEnR," should be repositioned to the upper-left of the graphic instead of being centrally located. Additionally, please use a dot pattern to delineate the areas where the circles overlap".

**Response** Thank you very much for taking the time to review our manuscript and for your thoughtful feedback. Indeed, this paper is a methodology article that addresses the conceptual and pedagogical underpinnings of community-engaged research (CEnR) teaching and learning.

Table: As suggested, we have recreated the table in a single-column format to enhance clarity and focus.

Please see the revised Table in page 15-16.

Figure: Thank you for the valuable suggestion regarding the figure. Unfortunately, I was unable to incorporate the dot pattern to clearly delineate the overlapping areas of the circles due to technical limitations. However, I adjusted the transparency levels to partially address your suggestion and make the overlapping areas more visually distinct. Regarding the placement of the title, we opted to retain "Pedagogy of CEnR" at the center of the figure, as this positioning visually represents the integrative nature of the three intersecting elements — Foundational Principles, Design Strategies, and Teaching–Learning Practices — which collectively constitute the central concept of the Pedagogy of CEnR. We hope this revised version of the figure effectively conveys the intended relationships.

Please see the revised figure in page 18.

**Responsible editor: M Mostafa Zaman**, ORCID: [0000-0002-1736-1342](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1736-1342)

**5. Comment** Please submit the revised version along with a point-by-point response within a week. Kindly acknowledge that you are one of the editorial board members in your COI statement.

**Response** The point-by-point response has been provided.

COI statement: Tanvir C Turin serves as Editorial Board Member for the BSMMU Journal. Dr. Turin was not involved in the editorial decision-making process related to the acceptance of this article for publication.