

RESEARCH

Open Access



# Reimagining a pass/fail clinical core clerkship: a US residency program director survey and meta-analysis

Andrew Wang<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Krystal L. Karunungan<sup>1</sup>, Jacob D. Story<sup>1</sup>, Nathan A. Shlobin<sup>3</sup>, Jiyun Woo<sup>4</sup>, Edward L. Ha<sup>1</sup>, Karen E. Hauer<sup>5</sup> and Clarence H. Braddock III<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Pass/fail (P/F) grading has emerged as an alternative to tiered clerkship grading. Systematically evaluating existing literature and surveying program directors (PD) perspectives on these consequential changes can guide educators in addressing inequalities in academia and students aiming to improve their residency applications.

In our survey, a total of 1578 unique PD responses (63.1%) were obtained across 29 medical specialties. With the changes to United States Medical Licensure Examination (USMLE), responses showed increased importance of core clerkships with the implementation of Step 2CK cutoffs. PDs believed core clerkship performance was a reliable representation of an applicant's preparedness for residency, particularly in Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education's (ACGME) Medical Knowledge and Patient Care and Procedural Skills. PDs disagreed with P/F core clerkships because it more difficult to objectively compare applicants. No statistically significant differences in responses were found in PD preferential selection when comparing applicants from tiered and P/F core clerkship grading systems. If core clerkships adopted P/F scoring, PDs would further increase emphasis on narrative assessment, sub-internship evaluation, reference letters, academic awards, professional development and medical school prestige.

In the meta-analysis, of 6 studies from 2,118 participants, adjusted scaled scores with mean difference from an equal variance model from PDs showed residents from tiered clerkship grading systems overall performance, learning ability, work habits, personal evaluations, residency selection and educational evaluation were not statistically significantly different than from residents from P/F systems.

Overall, our dual study suggests that while PDs do not favor P/F core clerkships, PDs do not have a selection preference and do not report a difference in performance between applicants from P/F vs. tiered grading core clerkship systems, thus providing fertile grounds for institutions to examine the feasibility of adopting P/F grading for core clerkships.

**Keywords** Medical education, Educational assessment, Clerkship, Residency and internship, Applicant selection

\*Correspondence:

Andrew Wang  
andrewwang@mednet.ucla.edu

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© The Author(s) 2023. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

## Introduction

Assessment of student performance in core clinical clerkships leads to grade assignments which are associated with residency selection by program directors (PD). Pass/fail (P/F) grading has emerged as an alternative to tiered clerkship grading [1]. Proponents contend that P/F grading promotes the development of a foundation for self-regulated learning and reduces grade inflation while promoting student wellness and minimizing racial and ethnic disparities [2, 3]. However, others argue that P/F grading increases stress, removes objective measures that allow differentiation on residency applications. Nonetheless, P/F grading has been widely adopted for preclinical coursework and United States Medical Licensure Examination (USMLE) Step 1 to P/F in January 2022. Many medical schools have temporarily adopted P/F grading in response to the COVID-19 pandemic following the guidance of the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME) [4]. These changes have spurred further discussions on the potential implications of permanently adopting a P/F core clerkship. Systematically evaluating existing literature and surveying PD perspectives on these consequential changes can guide educators in addressing inequalities in academia and students aiming to improve their residency applications.

## Methods

For the survey, the authors manually queried a subset (2500 of more than 5000 programs, outreach > 50% for every medical specialty except internal medicine and family medicine) of valid PD emails through the ACGME public 2021–2022 List of Specialty Programs ( $n=29$ ). In rounds (1/2021–12/2021), PDs were contacted. This was 7-item anonymous online survey using the ExpertReview validation tool (Qualtrics XM operating system version X4 [Qualtrics International Inc]). The survey (using Qualtrics and Google Forms) (Supplementary Table 6) included questions on PD demographics. PDs were then prompted for their general perceptions regarding the impact of P/F clerkships in the context of changes to Step 1 and Step 2 CS on residency preparedness, selection and institutional disparities. Responses were recorded on 3-point Likert scales (disagree, neutral, agree) and reported as counts and percentages. Derived 95% confidence intervals (CI) were defined by AAPOR guidelines (Supplementary Table 3). Statistically significance ( $P < 0.05$ ) was considered by nonoverlapping 95% CI using Stata statistical software (StataCorp version 16.1). Subgroup analyses between regions and between AAMC-defined primary care (internal medicine, family medicine, pediatrics, internal medicine/pediatrics) and nonprimary care specialties were complete. Surveys with incomplete PD demographics were excluded ( $n=11$ ) and incomplete

surveys (< 3%) were censored. This study was IRB exempt because it used deidentified data.

For the meta-analysis, Embase, PubMed, and Scopus was searched since inception through 01/01/2022 (Supplementary Table 1) with no restrictions. Studies exploring P/F clerkship grading in the context of a cohort of PD assessments were included. Reviewers assessed study characteristics, clinical and nonclinical resident performance with PD's personal evaluation (worse:0 to best:100). This study followed the PRISMA guidelines (Supplementary Table 2).

## Results

The total survey response rate was 63.1% [ $n=1578$ ] (Table 1). The majority of participants were  $50 \pm 10$  years old and male (63.0% [ $n=994$ ]); had served as program directors for an average of  $6.8 \pm 6.2$  years and were distributed across US regions (Northeast 30.4% [ $n=480$ ], Midwest 25.2% [ $n=398$ ], South 24.0% [ $n=378$ ], West 20.4% [ $n=322$ ]). Family Medicine (13.1% [ $n=204$ ]), Internal Medicine (9.8% [ $n=155$ ]), Surgery (7.0% [ $n=110$ ]), were the most commonly represented specialties. More responses from non-primary care (72.4% [ $n=1082$ ]) specialties were collected than primary care specialties (31.4% [ $n=496$ ]). Since changes to USMLE Step 1 to P/F and Step 2CS being discontinued, currently many PDs will implement a Step 2 CK cutoff score (71.2%, CI, 68.1–74.3;  $n=1124$ ), but no cutoff's in NBME score or minimum number of professional activities (research, community service, leadership) or supplemental application material would be required.

PDs believed (81.9%; 95% CI, 78.8–85.0;  $n=1292$ ) core clerkship performance was a reliable representation of an applicant's preparedness for residency, particularly in Medical Knowledge (53.4%; 95% CI, 50.3–56.5;  $n=838$ ) and Patient Care and Procedural Skills (45.7%; 95% CI, 42.6–48.8;  $n=717$ ) (Table 1). PDs disagreed with P/F core clerkships (88.9%; 95% CI, 85.8–92.0;  $n=1403$ ), expressed concerns that P/F core clerkships would make it more difficult to objectively compare residency applicants (96.4%; 95% CI, 93.3–99.5;  $n=1521$ ) and make the applicant screening more arduous (86.5%; 95% CI, 83.4–89.6;  $n=1365$ ). Yet, no statistically significant differences in responses were found in PD preferential selection when comparing applicants from tiered and P/F core clerkship grading systems. If core clerkships adopted P/F scoring, PDs would further increase emphasis on Step 2 CK performance (83.2%; 95% CI, 80.1–86.3;  $n=1307$ ), narrative assessment (78.4%; 95% CI, 74.3–81.5;  $n=1232$ ), sub-internship evaluation (71.8%; 95% CI, 68.7–74.9;  $n=1127$ ), reference letters (65.9%; 95% CI, 62.8–79.0;  $n=1033$ ), academic awards or special honor societies (68.0%, 95% CI, 64.9–71.1;

**Table 1** Program director perspectives on residency preparedness and applicant selection following the change to pass/fail core clerkship grading

<b>A.</b>		<b>Respondents (N)</b>	<b>Response Rate (%)</b>
<b>Specialty</b>			
Anesthesiology		51/77	66.2
Child neurology		25/38	65.8
Dermatology		45/72	62.5
Emergency medicine		84/130	64.6
Family medicine		204/300	68
Internal medicine		155/229	68
Internal medicine/Pediatrics		61/108	56.5
Interventional radiology (integrated and independent)		26/45	57.8
Medical genetics and genomics		14/24	58.3
Neurologic surgery		36/59	61
Neurology		47/80	58.8
Nuclear medicine		7/19	36.8
Obstetrics and gynecology		91/132	68.9
Ophthalmology		41/63	65.1
Orthopedic surgery		63/101	62.4
Otolaryngology		38/62	61.3
Pathology		47/71	66.2
Pediatrics		76/106	71.7
Physical medicine and rehabilitation		24/47	51.1
Plastic surgery (integrated and independent)		35/52	67.3
Preventive medicine		17/36	47.2
Psychiatry		77/121	63.6
Radiation oncology		21/46	45.7
Radiology-diagnostic		57/97	58.8
Surgery		110/168	65.5
Thoracic surgery		21/37	57.8
Transitional year		37/81	45.7
Urology		50/73	68.5
Vascular surgery (integrated)		18/32	56.3
<b>B.</b>			
<b>ACGME Core Competencies</b>	<b>Professionalism and Ethics</b>	1551	25.70% 40.50% 33.80%
			(22.6-28.8) (37.4-43.6) (30.7-36.9)
	<b>Interpersonal and Communication Skills</b>	1554	24.70% 40.00% 35.30%
			(21.6-27.8) (26.9-43.1) (32.2-38.4)
	<b>Medical Knowledge</b>	1570	18.30% 28.30% 53.40%
			(15.2-21.4) (25.2-31.4) (50.3-56.5)
	<b>Systems-Based Practice</b>	1569	23.50% 43.50% 33.00%
			(20.4-26.6) (40.4-46.6) (29.9-36.1)
	<b>Patient Care and Procedural Skills</b>	1569	21.10% 33.20% 45.70%
			(18.0-24.2) (30.1-36.3) (42.6-48.8)
	<b>Practice-Based Learning and Improvement</b>	1562	22.60% 39.90% 37.50%
			(19.5-25.7) (36.8-44.0) (34.4-40.6)

**Table 1** (continued)

<b>Residency applicant selection factors</b>	<b>Clerkship narrative assessment</b>	1571	7.20%	14.40%	78.40%
			(4.1-10.3)	(11.3-17.5)	(74.3-81.5)
	<b>Step 2 CK</b>	1571	4.70%	12.10%	83.20%
			(1.6-7.8)	(8.0-15.2)	(80.1-86.3)
	<b>NBME scores</b>	1555	14.70%	41.70%	43.60%
			(11.6-17.8)	(38.6-44.8)	(40.5-46.7)
	<b>Medical school prestige</b>	1567	19.80%	27.50%	52.70%
			(16.7-32.9)	(24.4-30.6)	(49.6-55.8)
	<b>Reference letters</b>	1568	8.70%	25.40%	65.90%
			(5.6-11.8)	(22.3-28.5)	(62.8-69.0)
<b>Academic Inequalities</b>	<b>Sub-internship evaluation</b>	1570	4.00%	24.20%	71.80%
			(0.9-7.1)	(21.1-27.3)	(68.7-74.9)
	<b>Personal statement</b>	1559	12.40%	45.90%	41.70%
			(9.3-15.5)	(42.8-49.0)	(38.6-44.8)
	<b>Professional development activities</b>	1562	7.10%	34.40%	58.50%
			(4.0-10.2)	(31.1-37.5)	(55.4-61.6)
	<b>Academic awards or special honor societies</b>	1565	5.70%	26.30%	68.00%
			(2.6-8.8)	(23.2-29.4)	(64.9-71.1)
	<b>Medical student burnout</b>	1562	52.80%	33.50%	13.70%
			(49.7-55.9)	(30.4-36.6)	(10.6-16.8)
	<b>Gender and racial/ethnic disparities</b>	1529	55.10%	28.00%	16.90%
			(52.0-58.2)	(24.9-31.1)	(13.8-20.0)
	<b>Grade inflation</b>	1566	34.70%	21.20%	44.10%
			(31.6-37.8)	(18.1-24.3)	(41.0-47.2)
	<b>Variations in tiered grading distribution</b>	1565	32.70%	24.80%	42.50%
			(29.6-35.8)	(21.7-27.9)	(39.4-45.6)

$n=1064$ ), professional development (58.5%; 95% CI 55.4–61.6;  $n=914$ ) and medical school prestige (52.7%; 95% CI, 51.1–57.3;  $n=826$ ). Findings for reference letters remained significant only among non-primary care PD specialties. Finally, in addressing academic inequalities in core clerkship, while PDs agreed changing core clerkship to P/F would help improve grade inflation (44.1%; 95% CI, 41.0-47.2;  $n=691$ ) and variations in tiered grading distributions (42.5%; 95% CI, 39.3–45.5;  $n=665$ ), PDs did not agree gender and racial/ethnic disparities (55.1%; 95% CI, 52.0-58.2;  $n=842$ ) and burnout (52.8%; 95% CI, 49.7–55.9;  $n=825$ ) would be improved.

In the meta-analysis, 6 studies from 4,931 studies were identified with 2,118 participants at a median response rate of 81.0% (Supplementary Table 5) [5–10]. Overall, 7 specialties from PD respondents were represented and all studies were published before 2000 and were nonrandomized control trials (Supplementary

Table 4). Reported as means, there was no difference in PD preference for residents from P/F or tiered grading system throughout residency training (37.0% Tiered; 95% CI, 0-100,  $p>0.05$ ). Adjusted scaled scores with mean difference from an equal variance model from PDs showed residents from tiered clerkship grading systems overall performance (5.5; 95% CI, 0.0-12.9), learning ability (2.7; 95% CI, 0.0-5.4), work habits (2.9; 95% CI, 0.0-5.8), personal evaluations (-1.6; 95% CI, -3.8-0.6) and educational evaluation (1.7; 95% CI, 0.0-4.3) were not statistically significantly different than from residents from P/F systems. However, there was a difference in the number of qualities of work products produced (6.8; 95% CI, 1.4–12.2,  $p<0.0001$ ). Meta-regression standard difference in means revealed no difference in tiered system residents' overall performance in residency compared to P/F applicants (0.0001 fixed,  $p>0.05$ ; -0.0047 random,  $p>0.015$ ) (Table 2).

**Table 2** Forest Tree Plot of studies examining PD overall performance assessment between residents from tiered or P/F clerkship grading

**Summary of Studies P/F (-) vs Tiered (+)**

Model	Study name	Statistics for each study				p-Value	Std diff in means and 95% CI
		Std diff in means	Variance	Lower limit	Upper limit		
	Moss et al. (1978)	0.618	0.028	0.288	0.948	0.000	
	Tardiff et al. (1980)	0.259	0.003	0.158	0.360	0.000	
	Carmel et al. (1979)	0.000	0.030	-0.339	0.339	1.000	
	Hughes et al. (1983)	-0.130	0.002	-0.224	-0.036	0.006	
	Vosti et al. (1999)	-0.952	0.015	-1.195	-0.708	0.000	
Fixed		0.001	0.001	-0.063	0.064	0.979	
Random		-0.047	0.037	-0.425	0.331	0.808	

**Discussion**

The Coalition for Physician Accountability Review Committee has recommendations for changes to the residency match process – bringing a new paradigm that moves away from the “overreliance on licensure examination scores in the absence of valid, trustworthy measures of students’ competence and clinical abilities”. Our findings suggest that while PDs do not favor P/F core clerkships, PDs do not have a selection preference and do not report a difference in performance between applicants from P/F vs. tiered grading core clerkship systems.

The ACGME Outcomes Project Advisory Committee has established a framework of clinical competencies to guide medical schools in developing their clinical education programs. Perhaps as a result, PDs believed that core clerkship performance was a reliable representation of an applicant’s preparedness for residency. However, as ACGME continues to favor outcome-based measurements [11], medical schools are now expected to demonstrate how they use educational outcomes to improve student performance with little guidance. PDs did not feel strongly about whether the use of a tiered grading system for clerkship is adequate in ensuring that the ACGME clinical competencies are achieved. Shifting to P/F may allow institutions to focus on improving the quality of clerkship MSPE letters through greater emphasis on direct observation and real-time feedback [12].

The expansion of P/F grading in medical education - from preclinical coursework to Step 1 to core clerkships - has been driven by studies advocating for its potential to improve learning, wellness and academia inequalities [3]. Conversely, tiered clerkship grades and narrative assessments have been shown to be biased against underrepresented minority students, impeding efforts to improve diversity across specialties [2]. While PDs agreed that transitioning core clerkships to P/F would improve grade

inflation and variations in tiered grading distributions, they did not believe racial, ethnic or gender disparities or burnout would improve. Further study is needed not only to balance calls for a P/F medical curriculum with the need for objective metrics, but also to determine whether doing so can sufficiently address existing disparities [13].

Several limitations of this study should be considered. First, the meta-analysis had a relatively small number of studies and medical specialties included, with all studies published prior to the year 2000 representing a different environment for resident selection compared to day. However, our prospective survey of PDs across specialties demonstrated similar results. Second, the meta-analysis’s resident survey assessment questions were not standardized and often normative perceptions, only quantitative data was summarized utilizing adjusted mean differences to compare performances. Third, while the survey total number of respondents was high, overall response rate across all specialties was insufficient to avoid selection and availability heuristic bias which limits generalizability. However, no difference was observed during subgroup and sensitivity analysis. Finally, this study focused on PDs associated with MD degree granting programs and may not be applicable to DO related programs.

We suggest that the COVID-19 pandemic has provided fertile grounds for institutions to examine the feasibility of adopting P/F grading for core clerkships. As educators begin to decide the extent to which their curricula will be shaped by the pandemic, medical education remains at a turning point.

**Abbreviations**

- AAEE American Medical Education in Europe Guide
- AAMC Association of American Medical Colleges
- ACGME Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education
- AAPOR American Association for Public Opinion Research
- CI Confidence Interval

CK	Clinical Knowledge
CS	Clinical Skills
ERAS	Electronic Residency Application Service
FSMB	Federation of State Medical Boards
IRB	Institutional Review Board
LCME	Liaison Committee on Medical Education
MSPE	Medical Student Performance Evaluation
NBME	National Board of Medical Examiners
P/F	Pass/Fail
PRISMA	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses
PD	Program Director
USMLE	United States Medical Licensure Examination

## Supplementary Information

The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-023-04770-8>.

**Additional file 1: Supplementary Table 1.** Search Strategy. **Supplementary Table 2.** PRISMA Checklist. **Supplementary Table 3.** AAPOR Disclosure Checklist. **Supplementary Table 4.** Characteristics of the Included Studies Examining PD Perceptions on P/F Clerkship [1-6]. **Supplementary Table 5.** Flow Chart of Study Selection to Quantitatively Evaluate PD Perceptions of Residents from Schools with Tiered Versus P/F Clerkship Grading. **Supplementary Table 6.** Program Director Online Survey.

### Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Molly Beestrup, MLIS (Galter Health Sciences Library, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL), for her insightful feedback on our study's search terms and continued support.

### Authors' contributions

Andrew Wang; study concept and design; drafting of the manuscript; acquisition of data; administrative, technical or material support; analysis and interpretation of data; critical revision of the manuscript. Krystal L. Karunungan - study concept and design; drafting of the manuscript; acquisition of data; administrative, technical or material support; analysis and interpretation of data; critical revision of the manuscript. Jacob D. Story - acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; and critical revision of the manuscript. Nathan Shlobin - acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; and critical revision of the manuscript. Jiyun Woo - administrative, technical or material support; and critical revision of the manuscript. Edward L. Ha - study concept and design; analysis and interpretation of data; and critical revision of the manuscript. Karen E. Hauer - study concept and design; analysis and interpretation of data; and critical revision of the manuscript. Clarence H. Braddock III - study concept and design; analysis and interpretation of data; and critical revision of the manuscript.

### Authors' information

None.

### Funding

UCLA – Medical Student Research & Scholarship [aw].

### Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

### Declarations

#### Ethics approval and consent to participate

This study was IRB exempt by UCLA's General Institutional Review Board (GIRB) because it used public deidentified survey data. Informed consent was obtained from all voluntary participants who submitted the survey. This study followed the AAPOR and PRISMA guidelines.

#### Consent for publication

Not applicable.

### Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

### Author details

<sup>1</sup>David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, 10833 Le Conte Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA. <sup>2</sup>College of Medicine, Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science, Los Angeles, CA, USA. <sup>3</sup>Feinberg School of Medicine, Northwestern University, Chicago, IL, USA. <sup>4</sup>Crean Lutheran High School, Irvine, CA, USA. <sup>5</sup>University of California, San Francisco School of Medicine, San Francisco, CA, USA.

Received: 1 March 2023 Accepted: 12 October 2023

Published online: 24 October 2023

### References

- Alexander EK, Osman NY, Walling JL, Mitchell VG. Variation and imprecision of clerkship grading in U.S. medical schools. *Acad Med.* 2012. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0b013e31825d0a2a>.
- Teherani A, Hauer KE, Fernandez A, King TE, Lucey C. How small differences in assessed clinical performance amplify to large differences in grades and awards: a cascade with serious consequences for students underrepresented in medicine. *Acad Med.* 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002323>.
- Spring L, Robillard D, Gehlbach L, Moore Simas TA. Impact of pass/fail grading on medical students' well-being and academic outcomes. *Med Educ.* 2011;45(9):867–77.
- LCME update on medical students, patients, and COVID-19: approaches to the clinical curriculum. (2020). <https://lcme.org/wp-content/uploads/filebase/March-20-2020-LCME-Approaches-to-Clinical-Curriculum.pdf>. Accessed 7 Apr 2020.
- Carmel H, Armini F. Comparison of the performance of psychiatric residents from pass/fail versus graded medical schools. *J Med Educ.* 1979. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-197911000-00013>.
- Moss TJ, Deland EC, Maloney JV. Selection of medical students for graduate training: Pass/Fail versus grades. *N Engl J Med.* 1978. <https://doi.org/10.1056/nejm197807062990106>.
- Tardiff K. The effect of pass-fail on the selection and performance of residents. *J Med Educ.* 1980. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-198008000-00002>.
- Hughes RL, Golmon ME, Patterson R. The grading system as a factor in the selection of residents. *J Med Educ.* 1983. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-198306000-00006>.
- Vosti KL, Jacobs CD. Outcome measurement in postgraduate year one of graduates from a medical school with a pass/fail grading system. *Acad Med.* 1999. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-199905000-00023>.
- Dietrick JA, Weaver MT, Merrick HW. Pass/fail grading: a disadvantage for students applying for residency. *Am J Surg.* 1991. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0002-9610\(91\)90204-Q](https://doi.org/10.1016/0002-9610(91)90204-Q).
- Natesan P, Batley NJ, Bakhti R, et al. Challenges in measuring ACGME competencies: considerations for milestones. *Int J Emerg Med.* 2018;11:39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12245-018-0198-3>.
- Hauer KE, Lucey CR. Core clerkship grading: the illusion of objectivity. *Acad Med.* 2019;94(4):469–72.
- Makhoul AT, Pontell ME, Ganesh Kumar N, Drolet BC. Objective measures needed - program directors' perspectives on a Pass/Fail USMLE Step 1. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382(25):2389–92. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp2006148>. PMID: 32558467.

### Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.