ECRONICON OPEN ACCESS

EC GYNAECOLOGY
Review Article

Before and Beyond PLAB: A Scholarly Reflection on Migration Professional Identity and Belonging in UK Medicine

Olubusola Amu[1]*, Morounfolu Olaleye Thompson[2], Adegboyega F Sanusi[3], Khaerat Adewunmi[1], Salwa Abu Yaqoub[1], Huda Al Saleh[1] and Zeina Bu Shurbak[1]

[1]Women's Wellness and Research Center, Doha, Qatar
[2]Al Wakra Hospital, Al Wakra, Qatar
[3]Watford General Hospital, Watford, UK

***Corresponding Author:** Olubusola Amu, Women's Wellness and Research Center, Doha, Qatar.

Received: October 23, 2026; **Published:** November 05, 2026

Abstract

Passing the Professional and Linguistic Assessments Board examination can divide a medical career into a remembered before and an anticipated after. The examination has a defined regulatory purpose, yet candidates may invest it with expectations of professional recognition, financial security and a more predictable future. This reflective special article considers the distance between those expectations and the work of establishing a career in UK medicine. It draws on selected primary research, regulatory reports and professional guidance, with particular attention to obstetrics and gynaecology. We examine preparation, interrupted seniority, communication, differential attainment, family life and the gradual reconstruction of professional confidence. PLAB is considered within its present relationship to the Medical Licensing Assessment, while older outcome studies are interpreted in their historical context. Passing an examination, obtaining registration, securing employment and entering specialist training are distinct events. Evidence about postgraduate assessment and employer referrals cannot, by itself, establish differences in patient safety or identify the cause of an individual doctor's difficulties. We propose that preparation for migration should include realistic career information and that employers should provide supervised transition, explicit feedback and access to development. Professional belonging depends partly on how institutions recognise previous experience and help doctors adjust to unfamiliar practice. A successful transition permits doctors to learn the expectations of UK practice while retaining the experience and judgement acquired elsewhere.

Keywords: *PLAB; International Medical Graduates; Professional Identity; Medical Migration; National Health Service; Differential Attainment; Obstetrics and Gynaecology; Belonging*

Introduction

A doctor preparing for PLAB is already a doctor. That simple fact can become obscured by the language of entry, eligibility and assessment. Before opening a revision book, the candidate may have completed internship, cared for seriously ill patients and assumed responsibilities that colleagues elsewhere would recognise immediately. Nevertheless, the decision to practise in the United Kingdom requires an established professional identity to be presented again for assessment. Knowledge must be demonstrated in an unfamiliar format. Previous experience must be explained to people who may not know the institutions in which it was acquired.

The Professional and Linguistic Assessments Board examination has a specific purpose. The General Medical Council describes it as assessing whether an international medical graduate knows and can do what is expected of a doctor beginning the second year of the UK Foundation Programme [1]. Its social meaning can be much wider. For a candidate and family, a pass may represent the possibility of stable employment, further training or a life less constrained by circumstances at home. An examination result can therefore carry hopes that no examination system could fulfil on its own.

PLAB now meets the requirements of the Medical Licensing Assessment, with its two parts corresponding to the applied knowledge and clinical and professional skills components [2]. This alignment matters when interpreting older studies or recollections. Candidates from different decades have encountered different assessment arrangements and employment conditions. There is no single, timeless PLAB experience, and international medical graduates do not all enter UK practice through this route.

The professional transition continues after a pass. Doctors must learn how a new service works, find a role that makes appropriate use of their abilities and regain the confidence to contribute fully. Obstetrics and gynaecology makes these questions especially visible because urgent decisions coexist with intimate care, emotionally difficult conversations and complex teamwork. The implications extend across medicine.

Scope and reflective approach

This is a scholarly reflective article informed by a targeted narrative review. The literature was identified through targeted searches using combinations of PLAB, international medical graduates, UK practice, transition, professional identity, induction, differential attainment and obstetrics and gynaecology. We consulted indexed primary studies and official GMC, NHS, RCOG and World Health Organization material. Selection favoured sources that clarified the regulatory purpose of PLAB or informed interpretation of professional transition. No exhaustive database search, registered protocol, formal risk of bias assessment or quantitative synthesis was undertaken.

The article offers a reflective interpretation of published evidence, without presenting personal recollections or patient narratives. Illustrative situations are used to examine professional dilemmas, not to estimate their frequency. Evidence concerning international graduates as a whole is distinguished from studies of PLAB registrants, and proposed changes are identified as recommendations.

Before PLAB the decision to leave

Before preparing for the examination, a doctor must decide whether to pursue a different professional future. The reasons may include access to training, family circumstances, personal safety, remuneration or dissatisfaction with the conditions in which medicine is practised. These motives can coexist. A doctor can remain committed to a country's patients and still decide that continuing to work there is no longer sustainable. Migration should not be interpreted as a simple measure of loyalty.

The decision also has an uneven distribution of risk. A candidate with savings, reliable internet access and relatives in Britain can prepare under different conditions from a colleague funding examination attempts through extra clinical work. An apparently individual achievement may depend on a household accepting deferred plans, reduced income or prolonged separation. These commitments form part of the cost of migration, although they are seldom visible in accounts centred on examination success.

Professional advice at this stage should be candid about the sequence ahead. Passing PLAB is one part of a registration route; the GMC's full registration guidance also addresses internship and other application requirements [3]. Registration, immigration permission, a job offer and access to a training programme answer different questions. Treating them as a single destination encourages decisions based on an incomplete account of what success will require.

A further uncertainty concerns time. Preparation can occupy a period in which a doctor would otherwise develop a clinical service, accumulate operative experience or pursue postgraduate examinations at home. Whether migration ultimately proves advantageous does not erase that opportunity cost. A useful reflective question is therefore broader than whether the candidate can pass. It is whether the proposed route remains compatible with the doctor's circumstances if the first job takes longer than expected or the preferred specialty remains inaccessible.

The moral pressure around the decision deserves restraint. Families may see departure as an achievement, colleagues as a loss and the doctor as both. None of these views captures the whole decision. Advice should leave room for uncertainty, including the possibility of postponement or return. A career need not justify migration retrospectively through uninterrupted success.

Preparation and the temporary life of a candidate

Examination preparation changes the organisation of a working life. Familiar clinical knowledge must be retrieved quickly, expressed in the expected form and applied to the circumstances of UK practice. For an experienced doctor, revisiting general medicine can be useful and unsettling. A specialist may find that areas distant from everyday work demand more attention than the condition routinely managed with confidence. That difficulty says something about the breadth of the examination, not necessarily about the value of previous expertise.

Preparation can also sharpen clinical habits. Rehearsing an explanation makes omissions audible. Revising emergency management can expose assumptions that routine has concealed. The educational benefit should be acknowledged without turning the examination into a complete account of clinical development. A candidate may become more fluent in a station while still needing experience of real consultations, local referral systems and the practical consequences of treatment decisions.

Communication can suffer when preparation relies too heavily on rehearsal. A consultation can contain every expected phrase and still fail to respond to the person in front of the doctor. Learning to ask about concerns is useful; learning to hear an unexpected answer is harder. Candidates need enough structure to be safe and enough flexibility to remain attentive. Commercial preparation may help some candidates, but familiarity with a course should never be confused with endorsement by the regulator or a guarantee of success.

During preparation, the examination can come to dominate how a doctor sees the future. Conversations with colleagues and relatives return repeatedly to the result on which so many plans depend. Failure can then feel like a judgement on a whole career. A more proportionate interpretation recognises that a failed attempt identifies performance below the required standard in that assessment. It requires honest review, but it does not supply a complete explanation of a doctor's abilities or future contribution.

Success deserves a similarly proportionate reading. A pass is a substantial achievement because it meets a defined threshold under assessment conditions. It cannot establish that every subsequent task will be familiar. Candidates are best served by a preparation culture that celebrates the achievement and keeps the next learning needs visible.

After the result the unfinished arrival

Relief after a pass may soon give way to uncertainty about what comes next. The question changes from whether one can pass to where one can work, at what level and with what prospects. The uncertainty is less familiar than that of examination preparation. Examinations offer a published process and a result; employment decisions may feel less transparent to someone unfamiliar with local conventions. A curriculum vitae that was persuasive in one setting may need explanation in another.

The first appointment has educational consequences beyond its title. A department that introduces a new doctor carefully can make uncertainty manageable. A department that expects immediate fluency in local processes can turn ordinary questions into occasions for embarrassment. Slowther and colleagues' UK qualitative research found difficulties in negotiating unfamiliar ethical and professional

expectations, with support varying according to the posts doctors held [4]. Although the study concerns an earlier period, it raises an enduring question about who takes responsibility for explaining the expectations of practice to a newly arrived doctor.

Settling in also requires practical arrangements that can be difficult to manage alongside a new job. A doctor may need accommodation, a bank account and reliable transport at the same time as learning a clinical role. Such tasks compete for attention even when they are eventually resolved. A considerate employer asks about these pressures early, without requiring disclosure of private circumstances. Practical help should be available through a clear contact, rather than depending on the goodwill of whichever colleague happens to notice a problem.

The NHS induction guide for international graduates provides a basis for organising this support [5]. Its existence should move the discussion beyond whether newcomers ought to be helped. The question is whether the promised preparation is delivered before duties make it difficult to attend. Induction squeezed between service commitments risks becoming an administrative record of attendance rather than a period of supported adjustment.

The first weeks also influence how a doctor interprets later experiences. If questions receive patient answers, uncertainty becomes discussable. If questions attract ridicule, the doctor learns to conceal it. That response may appear to be confidence until a difficult situation reveals what was never understood. The receiving team's behaviour therefore helps determine the quality of the information available to supervisors.

Seniority and the work of becoming known again

Migration can separate clinical experience from recognised position. A doctor who previously led a team may enter a post with a narrower remit. Sometimes that is an appropriate arrangement while local competence is established. The difficulty arises when the period of adjustment has no stated objectives or review point. Temporary caution can become a permanent account of what the doctor is capable of doing.

Previous experience should be assessed carefully and used appropriately. An employer should ask what the doctor has done, under what supervision, how recently and with what evidence of proficiency. The doctor should be able to distinguish independent experience from exposure gained in training. This conversation serves both parties. It avoids assuming that a familiar title carries identical responsibilities across countries and avoids discarding substantial experience because its documentation looks different.

Clinical judgement is partly local. Knowing when to operate does not establish familiarity with a hospital's escalation pathway or postoperative facilities. Conversely, uncertainty about an electronic system does not imply uncertainty about diagnosis. Supervisors should identify which component of a task requires support. Otherwise a narrow difficulty can become an imprecise judgement about overall competence, repeated in references and difficult to challenge.

There is an emotional cost to becoming a beginner in selected parts of a profession already practised for years. The doctor may oscillate between reluctance to ask a basic question and frustration at being treated as inexperienced in everything. Neither reaction is helped by advice simply to be humble. A more useful approach gives permission to state both experience and uncertainty accurately. Professional maturity includes knowing where each applies.

Professional standing is rebuilt through everyday clinical work. A colleague sees a careful assessment, receives a reliable handover or watches an appropriately timed request for help. Trust develops through these observations. Fair supervision creates opportunities for them to occur. Without such opportunities, a doctor can remain little known while being repeatedly asked to prove readiness for responsibility.

Learning the language of everyday practice

Language proficiency and ease within a workplace overlap imperfectly. A doctor may understand medical terminology yet hesitate over colloquial descriptions of symptoms, regional speech or the indirect language of disagreement. Equally, colleagues may misread an unfamiliar accent or conversational style. These possibilities require attention to the actual exchange rather than assumptions about the speaker's nationality. Educational resources on professional communication can help make these expectations explicit [6].

The most useful feedback identifies an observable problem. Saying that a doctor needs better communication is too broad to guide change. Explaining that the urgency of a referral was unclear, that the patient had no opportunity to ask a question, or that a handover omitted the agreed action gives the doctor something to practise. Feedback should also check understanding on both sides. A colleague who heard an unfamiliar expression may need clarification rather than a judgement about fluency.

Accent should be approached with similar care. Clear speech matters when it affects understanding, especially in urgent care. The relevant test is whether information is understood accurately and promptly. Preference for a familiar accent is a different matter. Teams can support safety through confirmation of critical information, explicit recommendations and a willingness to ask for repetition without humiliation.

Communication is also a matter of hierarchy. A doctor accustomed to indirect disagreement may need help making an urgent concern unmistakable. Another may be clinically clear but sound abrupt to colleagues. Neither pattern can be inferred reliably from country of qualification. Supervised practice should focus on what happened in a particular conversation and what would improve it. A new doctor should not have to infer local expectations from a complaint received months later.

Professional adaptation can broaden communication rather than erase a previous identity. Many doctors bring experience of multilingual practice and of explaining difficult choices where resources are limited. These abilities can contribute to patient care in the UK and deserve recognition alongside any need for further preparation.

Patient autonomy and the meaning of good care

Moving between health systems can make ethical assumptions visible. A doctor may have practised where relatives played a prominent role in receiving information, where access to investigations was constrained or where patients expected a directive recommendation. Such arrangements vary within countries as well as between them. They should be explored individually, without treating an entire professional culture as ethically uniform.

Good medical practice establishes duties concerning competence, partnership with patients, respectful teamwork and honesty [7]. These duties apply to the whole medical workforce. An international graduate's induction should therefore be connected to the standards used in daily supervision, while established colleagues remain accountable to the same expectations. A newcomer should not be asked to demonstrate respectful behaviour in a workplace that tolerates contempt towards them.

Consent offers a practical example. GMC guidance emphasises the exchange of information and the support patients need to make decisions [8]. In obstetrics and gynaecology, a technically correct explanation may still leave important questions unanswered: what matters to this woman, what alternatives are acceptable to her and what does she understand about the proposed intervention? Learning the applicable professional framework should deepen attention to these questions rather than produce a longer recitation of risks.

For example, a clinician counselling about hysterectomy may explain the operation confidently yet benefit from supervision in exploring a woman's concerns about fertility, sexual function or recovery. The relevant learning need is specific. It does not establish that care provided elsewhere lacked compassion. Likewise, a confident explanation in familiar language does not guarantee that the woman has been heard. Ethical practice requires continuing scrutiny from every clinician.

The experience of migration may make a doctor more attentive to the discomfort of unfamiliar institutions. Whether that experience improves care depends on how thoughtfully it is examined. Reflection becomes useful when the doctor asks how personal assumptions influence care and changes practice where necessary. Having crossed a professional boundary does not remove the obligation to examine one's own judgement.

Assessment progression and the limits of comparison

Passing PLAB does not settle every question about subsequent professional performance. A national data linkage study by Tiffin and colleagues found differences in postgraduate Annual Review of Competence Progression outcomes between PLAB registrants and UK graduates [9]. McManus and Wakeford found lower average performance among PLAB graduates in the MRCP(UK) and MRCGP examinations, while also finding that PLAB scores predicted subsequent examination performance [10]. These studies warrant serious attention because licensing decisions should be informed by evidence of later performance.

Their interpretation requires precision. Postgraduate examination results and progression decisions are educational outcomes. They do not directly measure avoidable harm to patients. The studies concern historical cohorts and assessment arrangements; they cannot be read as evaluations of the present MLA-compliant PLAB system. Nor does an association at group level explain why a particular doctor struggled or establish what intervention would have changed the outcome.

When a doctor struggles, a useful review examines preparation for assessment, access to relevant clinical experience, the quality of supervision and the consistency of the assessment itself. Place of qualification alone cannot explain an individual outcome. Educational, organisational and individual factors all require consideration.

Standards should remain explicit and demanding. A genuine gap in knowledge or judgement must be addressed promptly. Equally, supporting a doctor to meet a standard is part of maintaining that standard. Repeating an unsuccessful assessment without identifying the underlying difficulty is a poor educational response. So is assuming that differences in outcomes must disappear once candidates become more resilient.

Career development also requires attention to those working outside formal training programmes. A doctor can become highly useful to a service while acquiring little evidence needed for the next appointment. Rota contribution and professional progression are related but different. Supervisors should discuss both, including whether the current post can realistically support the doctor's stated ambitions.

Regulatory anxiety and fair treatment

The possibility of a complaint can weigh heavily on a doctor whose livelihood and family arrangements depend on continuing practice. Anxiety may encourage excessive checking or discourage questions perceived as revealing weakness. Such responses will vary between doctors, and migration alone cannot explain an individual's approach to uncertainty.

The GMC commissioned Fair to refer research identified organisational contributors to disproportionate employer referrals, including inadequate induction, isolation, poor feedback and cultures of blame [11]. The findings support examination of how concerns develop and are handled. They do not establish that every referral is biased or that genuine performance concerns should be discounted. Fairness requires protection for patients and a proportionate, evidence-based response to the doctor.

One practical implication is to record concerns early and specifically, together with the support offered and the doctor's response. A vague impression allowed to accumulate can become more damaging than a difficult conversation held promptly. The same process should examine workload, supervision and access to advice. Individual accountability becomes clearer when the conditions of practice are described honestly.

Informal advantage also deserves scrutiny. Some doctors learn which consultant will explain a difficult case, how to obtain a teaching opportunity or whom to approach about a reference through established social networks. A newcomer may lack this knowledge. Departments can reduce dependence on personal access by making opportunities visible and explaining selection decisions. Mentorship helps, but it cannot substitute for fair allocation of work and education.

Professional belonging is tested when something goes wrong. A doctor who is supported only while performing well has conditional acceptance of limited value. A fair organisation listens, investigates and acts consistently when the circumstances are uncomfortable. That consistency makes it easier for doctors to disclose uncertainty before an incident becomes serious.

Family life and the private meaning of success

A medical career is lived within a household, even when the doctor migrates alone. The practical achievement of securing work may coexist with loneliness, a partner's interrupted career or concern for relatives abroad. Professional advancement may therefore coexist with considerable personal difficulty. Salary, title and geographic location do not fully describe whether a move has improved a family's life.

The emotional timetable may also differ between family members. A doctor absorbed in the demands of a first post may experience progress while a partner experiences isolation. Children may settle at a different pace from their parents. These differences deserve attention because family circumstances can affect concentration and wellbeing even when clinical work appears to be progressing well.

Success can become difficult to discuss honestly when others have invested heavily in it. The doctor may feel obliged to report only good news. A confidential mentor or peer group can provide room to reconsider plans without turning every difficulty into a verdict on the original decision. Seeking help, changing direction or returning home can be responsible decisions rather than evidence that the migration project has failed.

Financial expectations also need personal review. Greater nominal earnings do not establish greater disposable income or security once housing, dependants and relocation costs are considered. The financial consequences need to be considered in the circumstances of the household, rather than inferred from an assumed overseas salary advantage.

Over time, the meaning of home may change. Some doctors settle permanently, some return and others continue to work across countries. None of these outcomes should be treated as the natural conclusion of passing PLAB. The examination permits a step in a career; it does not decide where a person ought to belong.

Obstetrics and gynaecology as a demanding transition

The specialty brings several adjustments into close proximity. A doctor may need to interpret an unfamiliar record, communicate with a woman in pain, coordinate with midwives and seek senior help within minutes. Technical competence is indispensable, but safe action also depends on knowing who is available and how a decision is shared. These are local capabilities that must be established in the actual department.

Preparation should therefore include the clinical situations in which unclear responsibilities would be dangerous. A supervised discussion of escalation during haemorrhage, for example, can establish who contacts anaesthesia, who coordinates blood provision and how senior obstetric review is obtained. Such orientation complements specialist knowledge. It should include the whole team, since uncertainty about a new doctor's role is rarely confined to the doctor alone.

RCOG resources recommend hospital and departmental induction and direct international graduates towards national support [12]. Guidance also addresses the needs of specialty, associate specialist and specialist doctors and locally employed doctors [13]. These

categories should not be treated as interchangeable with PLAB graduates, but they highlight employment settings in which individual support needs must be made explicit.

Intimate care requires particular attention to dignity, communication and the applicable consent and chaperone arrangements. Simulation and observed consultations can make expectations discussable before a misunderstanding occurs. At the same time, a doctor's previous experience of obstetric emergencies or complex pelvic surgery may enrich departmental learning. Supervision should create room for that contribution rather than position every international colleague exclusively as a recipient of instruction.

The transition also affects the established team. Supervisors need time to observe, discuss cases and provide feedback. Asking them to support a new colleague without adjusting an already overstretched workload weakens the programme before it begins. A department should recognise induction as clinical work with a patient safety purpose and assign responsibility for delivering it.

Supporting the months after PLAB

The GMC Welcome to UK practice workshop offers a recognised resource for doctors and supervisors [14]. Attendance can form part of preparation, but local practice still needs to be taught where it occurs. A new doctor needs functioning access to records, a clear scope of duties and someone available to answer questions. An induction certificate should never be used as evidence that all of these conditions have been met.

There is some encouraging evidence for tailored induction. Baryeh and colleagues reported improved perceptions of welcome, confidence and understanding following a tailored induction programme [15]. The evaluation provides evidence about early experience rather than proof of reduced clinical harm or sustained career progression. Further evaluation is needed, particularly of longer-term outcomes.

We propose a transition plan agreed before the doctor joins routine duties. It should identify prior experience, immediate learning needs, the supervisor responsible and the arrangements for obtaining urgent help. The initial workload should permit observation and discussion. Responsibilities can then expand as competence in the relevant setting is demonstrated. The duration should respond to the individual and the role rather than a universal assumption about international graduates.

Reviews in the early weeks and subsequent months should ask whether the doctor can perform the allocated work safely, whether promised supervision is available and whether the post offers appropriate development. These suggested review points are practical proposals, not validated intervals. The doctor should be able to correct inaccurate assumptions and record unmet needs. If a problem persists, the plan should change rather than merely document the same concern again.

Programmes should be evaluated with more than attendance or immediate satisfaction. Relevant outcomes include access to supervision, completion of agreed learning, confidence in escalation, progression and retention. Patient safety outcomes require careful design and adequate follow-up. Comparisons must account for differences in posts and previous experience. A programme that makes doctors feel welcomed may be valuable even before its longer-term clinical effects are known, but the distinction should remain explicit.

Migration responsibility and the contribution of experience

Reflection on life after PLAB should include the service left behind. Departure may remove a clinician, trainer or potential leader from a health system already under pressure. The size and consequences of that loss vary. It is ethically inadequate either to ignore it or to make the individual doctor solely responsible for repairing it. Personal freedom and responsibility for workforce planning operate at different levels.

The WHO Global Code of Practice frames international recruitment through the interests of migrant health personnel, source countries and destination countries [16]. This supports a broader account of responsibility than celebrating appointments alone. Receiving systems should consider whether recruitment arrangements contribute to sustainable training and service capacity. Source systems also have responsibilities for the conditions that make retaining clinicians possible.

Diaspora contributions can include teaching, research partnerships and support for clinical development. Their value depends on what local colleagues need and can sustain. Occasional visits or remote advice should not be assumed to compensate for lost clinical capacity. Partnerships deserve assessment by their practical benefit rather than the prominence of the visiting professional.

The experience acquired abroad may eventually change how a doctor understands earlier practice. Some habits will be reconsidered; others will be appreciated more fully. A mature reflection can acknowledge improved opportunities in Britain without depicting everything that preceded migration as deficient. Clinical resourcefulness, continuity with communities and responsibility assumed under difficult conditions can remain important parts of professional judgement.

For doctors who later supervise international colleagues, memory creates an obligation to act thoughtfully. Remembering a difficult arrival is useful if it leads to clearer explanation, fairer assessment and timely support. It becomes less useful when previous hardship is presented as a necessary test for the next generation. Experience should improve the conditions of entry.

Conclusion

Life before PLAB contains a professional history that the examination cannot summarise. Life after it contains decisions and responsibilities that a pass cannot settle. The result marks a legitimate regulatory achievement within a longer process of learning, employment and personal adjustment. For many doctors and their families, it also recognises a sustained commitment made under uncertain circumstances.

The subsequent transition requires commitment from both the doctor and the receiving service. Doctors must recognise the limits of their local knowledge, seek feedback and meet the standards expected of practice. Employers must make those standards understandable, provide adequate supervision and assess progress fairly. These responsibilities should be addressed together.

Professional belonging becomes tangible when a doctor can ask for help without humiliation, contribute previous experience without defensiveness and plan a future on the basis of honest advice. The lasting value of the PLAB journey is realised in the care that follows and in a professional identity broad enough to include the places, patients and colleagues who shaped it.

Funding and Sponsorship

None.

Competing Interests

None declared.

Ethics

This article presents a scholarly reflection and narrative discussion. It reports no original participant-level research and contains no identifiable patient information. Ethical approval and participant consent were not required.

Data Availability

No original dataset was generated or analysed.

Author Contributions

O Amu contributed conception and literature review. All other authors contributed literature and manuscript review.

Bibliography

1. General Medical Council. A guide to the PLAB test. London: GMC [cited 2026 Oct 23].
2. General Medical Council. PLAB and the MLA. London: GMC [cited 2026 Oct 23].
3. General Medical Council. Full registration for international medical graduates. London: GMC [cited 2026 Oct 23].
4. Slowther A., *et al.* Experiences of non-UK-qualified doctors working within the UK regulatory framework: a qualitative study. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 105.4 (2012): 157-165.
5. NHS England. Welcoming and valuing international medical graduates: a guide to induction for IMGs recruited to the NHS (2022) [cited 2026 Oct 23].
6. Rustecki L. Induction package for international medical graduates. London: Health Education England (2021) [cited 2026 Oct 23].
7. General Medical Council. Good medical practice. London: GMC (2023) [Updated 2024 Dec 13; effective 2024 Jan 30; cited 2026 Oct 23].
8. General Medical Council. Decision making and consent. London: GMC (2020) [Updated 2026 Aug 3; cited 2026 Oct 23].
9. Tiffin P A., *et al.* Annual Review of Competence Progression (ARCP) performance of doctors who passed Professional and Linguistic Assessments Board (PLAB) tests compared with UK medical graduates: national data linkage study. *BMJ* 348 (2014): g2622.
10. McManus I C. and Wakeford R. PLAB and UK graduates' performance on MRCP(UK) and MRCGP examinations: data linkage study. *BMJ* 348 (2014): g2621.
11. Atewologun D., *et al.* Fair to refer? Reducing disproportionality in fitness to practise concerns reported to the GMC. General Medical Council (2019) [Cited 2026 Oct 23].
12. Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists. Living in the UK. London: RCOG [Cited 2026 Oct 23].
13. Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists. Induction for SAS and LE doctors. London: RCOG [Cited 2026 Oct 23].
14. General Medical Council. Welcome to UK practice. London: GMC [Cited 2026 Oct 23].
15. Baryeh K., *et al.* "Welcome to the NHS—Evaluating an International Medical Graduate Induction Programme". *British Journal of Hospital Medicine* 86.4 (2025): 1-14.
16. World Health Organization. WHO Global Code of Practice on the International Recruitment of Health Personnel. Geneva: WHO (2010) [Cited 2026 Oct 23].

Volume 15 Issue 11 November 2026
©All rights reserved by Olubusola Amu., *et al*.