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This systematic review, conducted in accordance with PRISMA guidelines, is aimed to review current research in virtual reality for healthcare training, specifically pertaining to non-technical skills. PsycInfo and Medline databases were queried for relevant articles published through December 2017. Of the 1377 publications identified, 80 were assessed for eligibility and 26 were finally included in the qualitative synthesis. Overall, the use of virtual training for non-technical skills is recent in healthcare education, and has increased since 2010. Screen-based VR simulators or virtual worlds are the most frequently used systems. The non-technical skills addressed in VR simulation include mainly teamwork, communication and situation awareness. The majority of studies evaluate the usability and acceptability of VR simulation, and few studies have measured the effects of VR simulation on non-technical skills development.

**Keywords:** virtual reality simulation; non-technical skills; healthcare training; medical education; systematic review.
Virtual reality simulation in non-technical skills training for healthcare professionals: a systematic review

Introduction

With the publication of To Err is Human in 1999(1) and Safety at the Sharp End(2), attention was drawn to the importance of human factors in operational teams, identifying skills that were first described for crew resource management in aviation and other high-risk industries. Flin described these non-technical skills (NTS) as “the cognitive, social and personal resource skills that complement technical skills, and contribute to safe and efficient task performance”(2). In Flin’s taxonomy, NTS included individual cognitive skills (e.g., situation awareness, decision-making, coping with stress and management of fatigue) and interprofessional social skills (e.g., cooperation and teamwork, conflict resolution, leadership). Evidence that human factors have an impact on surgical performance(3) led to the development of training programs focusing on NTS to improve patient safety(4). Using Flin’s taxonomy, several tools (i.e. ANTS, NOTSS, SPLINTS) have been designed to provide surgical teams with a common language to discuss and develop the human factors that are critical for patient safety(5).

Several studies have demonstrated the efficiency of simulation for knowledge acquisition and for technical(6–8) and non-technical(9,10) skills training in healthcare. Training healthcare professionals to manage rare or critical events in a standardized manner and without risk for the patient has become a major challenge(11). Although the benefits of simulation have been well documented, the human resources required for mannequin or standardized patient-based simulation and the availability of human resources in simulation centers remain scarce. However, various simulation methods have recently been developed using real actors, mannequins, standardized patients, computer simulators or serious games.
With the development of technology and the “laparoscopic surgery revolution”\(^{(12)}\), Virtual Reality (VR) simulators are being used more widely in both professional practice and education programs\(^{(13,14)}\). VR is a broad concept that encompasses three categories of simulators: screen-based VR simulators, virtual worlds, and immersive virtual reality environments. First, screen-based VR simulators have been used since the nineties to develop psychomotor skills for endoscopic surgery\(^{(15)}\). They consist of an interface comprising a computer and monitors coupled to mechanical devices or haptic units\(^{(16)}\). This kind of simulator requires very little set-up time and can be used repeatedly by learners for practice in different pathologies and with a number of anatomical variations\(^{(17)}\). Second, virtual worlds are three-dimensional virtual environments based on multiplayer online gaming, allowing users to free themselves from geographical proximity or time constraints (individual connection and full time access)\(^{(18–20)}\). For health professionals, medical furniture, instruments, devices, tools and characters are added to create dedicated medical virtual worlds\(^{(21)}\). Lastly, immersive virtual reality environments combine three-dimensional imaging, interactions with the environment, possible haptic feedback and head-mounted displays (HMD) or cave automatic virtual environments (CAVE, room-sized cube VR environments) to immerse the user and occlude the real world in order to provide a feeling of presence\(^{(13,22)}\).

The effects of VR-based training on healthcare professionals have mostly been studied in relation to the development of technical skills, either surgical (e.g., procedure, planning, knowledge of instruments) or psychomotor (e.g., dexterity, accuracy, speed)\(^{(23,24)}\). The use of VR simulation-based training for the development of NTS seems to be less common. In view of the recent developments described above, a systematic review of how VR has been used for NTS skills training and assessment could provide powerful new insights into the value and efficiency of this technique. This paper provides such a review, focusing on the use of virtual
reality in the evaluation and development of a predefined set of cognitive and interprofessional social skills required by healthcare professionals.

METHODS

Data source and search strategy

This systematic review followed the guidelines of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)\(^{(25)}\). The PICOS worksheet and search strategy\(^{(26)}\) were used to organize our research topics and terms, combining five concepts: Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome and Settings. Based on this framework, we produced a comprehensive research equation: “(nurs* OR scrub nurse OR surgeon* OR medical student OR nursing student OR health* OR OR clinical) AND (virtual reality OR virtual* OR virtual gaming simulation OR immers* OR OR serious game) AND (skills training OR training OR medical education) AND (non-technical skill* OR cognitive skill* OR team* OR leadership OR communicat* OR decision making OR task management)”. We searched two main databases, Psycinfo and Medline, because they both cover our fields of interest (healthcare, VR and NTS) and because their query forms are very similar, allowing us to use the same research equation. The search was conducted in May 2017 with a final extraction for screening on 11th December 2017.

Selection criteria

Inclusion of articles was based on the following criteria: 1) Focus on healthcare professionals working in teams; 2) Focus on Virtual Reality used in an educational or training context that includes outcomes data; 3) Focus on NTS in line with Flin’s pre-defined set of NTS referring to cognitive skills (situation awareness, decision-making, stress and management fatigue) and interprofessional social skills (cooperation and teamwork, conflict resolution, leadership). To get the most reliable source of scientific information, only publications in peer-reviewed journals were considered. Since VR is a relatively new
technology, the period chosen for study selection was between 2007 and 2017. Finally, to have an international overview, only articles written in English have been retained.

Study selection and eligibility criteria

We extracted 1373 references, 460 on Psycinfo and 913 on Medline. Four others found on Google Scholar while reading on the subject were added, thus making a total of 1377 references. We removed 188 abstracts in duplicate, resulting in 1189 titles and abstracts to read for selection. At this stage of the process, 1109 references were excluded.

In accordance with the first selection criterion, study populations that did not involve health professionals (e.g. pedestrians, cyclists, students, athletes or patients) were removed, as well as those working in smaller teams or solo (e.g. dentists, pharmacists and vets).

Following the second selection criterion, articles dealing with learning methods that were not the focus of this study were deleted (e.g., e-learning, e-classroom, web-based learning, telemedicine, mobile applications, social networks). According to the same criterion, some references were also excluded because the term “virtual” was used without referring to virtual reality (e.g., virtual teams, virtual communities, virtual classroom, virtual consultations and virtual patients). There is a vast literature on the “Virtual Patient”, focusing on the interpersonal social skills of healthcare professionals required to facilitate accurate diagnosis, give appropriate advice, and instruct patients about treatment. As these skills do not come within the scope of our predefined set, these references were not included in the present review.

Finally, according to the third criterion, articles that did not address NTS were excluded: knowledge representation (anatomy, physiology, histology, 3D planning for radiotherapy), technical skills, interpersonal patient-physician relationship (diagnosis, notification of critical results or pathology), psychiatric disorders (dementia, post-traumatic stress disorder), or
remediation (cognitive behavioral therapy, rehabilitation) that also use VR technologies but are out of the scope of this review.

This initial selection included 80 articles with abstracts that were insufficiently clear to decide whether or not they were eligible, and these were uploaded in order to read the full text. However, five remained unavailable even after their main authors were contacted by e-mail, which reduced the number of articles to read to 75.

After the full-text analysis, 49 articles were excluded for four reasons: 1) they did not involve NTS (n=31), 2) they did not use virtual reality (n=15), 3) they did not involve health professionals (n=2), or 4) it was a review article with no experiment (n=1).

Selection bias (inter-rater reliability)

To check the validity of the study, a sample of the articles (30%) was independently coded by the second author. Based on the eligibility criteria, the second coder decided whether or not to examine an article in depth. After reviewing the abstract and full text, the two coders, meaning the first and second authors, agreed on 26 articles, 11 that should be selected and 15 rejected. Their opinions only diverged on the implementation of NTS in one article (3.7%), which was eventually excluded (Cohen Kappa = .92). The selection process is summarized in the flowchart (see Figure 1).
To obtain a descriptive analysis of the results of this review, we drew up a comparative table, focusing on medical specialties, VR simulator typologies, study populations, and assessed NTS. For the latter, when assessment tools were mentioned, presence or absence of their validity evidence in the virtual environment was also examined. Another criterion for the analysis was outcomes, according to Kirkpatrick’s levels (see Table 1, Supplemental Digital Content 1, which shows the characteristics of the studies included in the review). This framework was chosen because the Kirkpatrick Model\(^{(27)}\) is frequently used to evaluate training programs; for example, it was recently used to evaluate serious games for training.
healthcare professionals\(^{(28)}\). This model has four levels: 1) affective reactions after the training program, 2) improvement of knowledge and skills, 3) change of behavior and transfer of skills in professional contexts, 4) increased patient care quality and reduced costs.

RESULTS

**Study characteristics**

VR is a recent technology and, as expected, the number of articles published per year over the last decade on this subject is rather low although it has been increasing, with a peak of seven articles in 2015. The median number of articles published per year is two (interquartile range [IQR] = 3-1, \(min = 0, max = 7\)).

Regarding sample size, the average number of participants was 39.69 (\(min = 10, max = 148, SD = 37.33\)). Looking more closely at their study design, 17 studies used an experimental design (pre-test/post-test, group comparisons or control/test group comparisons)\(^{(29–44)}\), nine were observational studies\(^{(18–20,45–50)}\), and one was based on qualitative interviews\(^{(51)}\).

**Medical specialties**

Emergency medicine\(^{(18,19,32,44,47)}\) and health education\(^{(20,37,41,50,51)}\) stand out from the rest with five articles each, but the latter includes issues that potentially concern all specialties or health professionals in different sectors. Next are urology\(^{(29,30,40,48)}\) and gastroenterology\(^{(33,34,45,46)}\) with four articles each. A further eight articles dealt with interprofessionality\(^{(18,32,37,41,47–50)}\).

**Study populations**

Most of the studies include a range of professions: nurses feature in eight articles\(^{(19,20,32,37,38,40,48,49)}\), surgeons\(^{(33,35,38,39,43,45,46)}\) in seven, and five articles mention other professionals\(^{(18,19,32,37,38)}\). With regard to students, 12 articles involve residents or postgraduate
trainees\(^{(18,33,35,36,38–40,42,44–46,48)}\), ten concern health students regardless of their level or specialty\(^{(30,31,39,41,44–47,50,51)}\), and three articles mention trainees\(^{(29,34,38)}\).

**VR systems**

In the studies selected for review, two technologies are equally represented: Screen-based VR simulators in 12 studies\(^{(29,30,33,34,36,38–40,42,43,48,49)}\) and virtual worlds in 12 articles\(^{(18–20,31,32,35,37,41,44,47,50,51)}\). Immersive virtual worlds are less common, as they are found in only three studies\(^{(39,45,46)}\).

**NTS and assessment metrics**

Among the 26 studies, the most frequently investigated NTS is teamwork, which is mentioned in 19 articles\(^{(18,19,29–32,34,35,37,38,40–42,45,47–51)}\). After that is communication\(^{(15/26)}\), followed by situation awareness\(^{(10/26)}\), decision-making\(^{(8/26)}\), leadership\(^{(8/26)}\), and stress management\(^{(6/26)}\). Most studies measured more than one NTS construct, with the exception of three articles focusing specifically on stress management\(^{(36,39,43)}\), three others on teamwork\(^{(19,35,45)}\), and one on communication\(^{(33)}\).

Specific metrics for NTS assessment are mentioned or described in detail in 16 articles\(^{(18,20,29–37,41–44,49)}\), ten of which\(^{(18,29,30,33,34,37,41–44)}\) mention and use specific validated assessment tools for NTS in the operating room or in a clinical environment (i.e. NOTECHS, NOTSS, T-NOTECHS, CGRS, M-OSANTS, TOSCE, T-TAQ, SURG-TLX, EMCRM). These assessment tools are presented as validated for simulation\(^{(52,53)}\), but none of them mention their validation in the very specific context of VR simulation. Four articles\(^{(31,34,36,42)}\) use scales designed for a specific NTS, but are not specific to the operating room or to health professionals (i.e. situation awareness, self-efficacy, anxiety). Six articles\(^{(18,20,32,35,43,49)}\) use their own tools or checklists, or open-ended questions rather than a questionnaire. Again,
none of these tools or checklists take into consideration the specificity of VR simulation, but are simply transferred from real life or traditional simulation contexts.

**Outcome measures**

The levels of assessment of the simulators or scenarios used in the studies reach Kirkpatrick’s level 1 (affective reactions) in 19 articles (18–20,29,30,37–48,51) and level 2 (learning: attitude, knowledge) in 18 (18,20,29–37,39,41–44,49,50). Level 3 (behavior) is only reached in two articles (33,34) that describe a test of skills transfer to the clinical environment in order to evaluate behavioral changes among trainees. No studies were found that reached level 4 (results) evaluating the effect of simulation on patient care quality and cost.

Overall, this review demonstrates that few medical specialties use virtual reality for NTS training. The most frequently used systems are screen-based VR simulators or virtual worlds, while immersive virtual worlds are rarely used. The most frequently studied NTS are the interpersonal and interprofessional social skills needed for effective medical teams, including teamwork and communication, together with situation awareness, which is a crucial cognitive ability.

**Objectives and findings of the studies**

Two main categories of study objectives emerged from our review (see Table 2, Supplemental Digital Content 2, which shows the objectives, measures and main findings of the studies).

The majority of studies are simulator or scenario centered, with a clear goal of establishing the acceptability of the technology for NTS training. This is the goal of 20 articles (18–20,29,31,35–39,41–49,51). As VR has only been introduced in healthcare training recently, it seems logical to assess this first. The general conclusion of these studies is that VR simulators offer promising opportunities for NTS training of health professionals. Their acceptability as an NTS training tool is validated either directly (37,41) or through one or more of its predictors as defined by Nielsen’s model of system acceptability (54): validity or...
fidelity\(^{(18,29,38,42,45,46)}\), usefulness or utility\(^{(41,42,44,46)}\), efficiency, effectiveness or
efficacy\(^{(19,35,47,48)}\), and usability\(^{(20,43,47)}\). The acceptability of VR simulators is not assessed
alone but together with teamwork\(^{(19,35,37,38,41,45,47,48,51)}\), situation awareness\(^{(20,31,46)}\), stress
management\(^{(39,43,46)}\), self efficacy\(^{(36)}\), and leadership\(^{(44)}\), or with several NTS using a dedicated
assessment tool such as NOTECHS or NOTSS\(^{(18,29,42)}\).

The purpose of the six remaining articles, among the most recent ones of this review,
is to propose different uses of VR simulation. One includes a virtual reality program that
focuses on communication tools as an initial introduction to team communication
strategies\(^{(50)}\). The other five are curriculum centered, their objectives being to incorporate
NTS training modules using VR simulators in the medical curriculum: four of them describe
distributed simulation\(^{(30,33,34,40)}\), in other words, the use of VR simulators initially designed for
teaching technical skills in wider settings or scenarios\(^{(29)}\), and the fifth\(^{(32)}\) addresses
emergency preparedness using a virtual world.

DISCUSSION

There are few medical specialties that use virtual reality simulation for NTS and their
goals vary. First, virtual worlds are used in healthcare education and in emergency medicine
to provide practice opportunities for rare events or extreme situations that are difficult to set
up in real life. Second, screen-based VR simulators are used for technical skills training in
domains involving laparoscopic surgery or robotic-assisted surgery, such as
gastroenterology\(^{(33,34)}\) and urology\(^{(30,40)}\) curricula. In the latter, NTS are introduced
progressively in VR simulation scenarios as trainees develop their technical skills\(^{(55)}\). This is
congruent with the conclusions of Shamim-Khan et al. (2013)\(^{(40)}\) and Rudarakanchana et al.
(2014)\(^{(38)}\) who observed that junior trainees focus more on technical skills and feel that the
introduction of NTS adds stress and anxiety due to the need to multitask. It also follows the
hierarchy of core, procedural and team skills proposed by Windsor (2009), who illustrates it with a musical analogy of note, melody and harmony: just like musicians begin to learn playing a note before trying to play a melody and then join an orchestra, core skills such as knot tying, dissecting or suturing, for example, should be trained before procedural skills (i.e. how to dissect out a pathology). Then, team skills can be trained\(^{(12)}\). Nevertheless, this progression does not enjoy consensus and must be considered for each set of NTS. For example, the addition of cognitive skills likely to help error-detection to technical skills training can result in more effective learning\(^{(56)}\).

Screen-based VR simulators or virtual worlds are thus the most frequently used systems. Immersive virtual worlds are less commonly used and are mentioned in only three articles\(^{(39,45,46)}\), two of them using head-mounted displays\(^{(39,46)}\). They were published between 2015 and 2016, which corresponds to the time when HMD such as Oculus Rift or HTC Vive became mainstream, even though immersive VR simulation is not a new technology in healthcare as it has been used since the early 2000s\(^{(57)}\). It will be interesting to see how these devices will be used in the future as their comfort and fields of view improve, and how they can be integrated into new surgical training modules.

One of the major interests of VR is its realism, which is stressed in several studies\(^{(29,38,39,42,45,46)}\). Even though avatars may sometimes behave awkwardly, and haptic feedback may be approximate or missing, participants still recognise the main features of their environments or work organizations. This contributes to the feeling of immersion mentioned in two articles\(^{(19,39)}\). These two notions are of particular interest in that they help trainees gain confidence\(^{(19,29,37,42)}\) by providing them with new learning opportunities, such as discovering an emergency room without stress\(^{(47)}\), or being able to develop the skills needed to react to disasters when training in an unfamiliar environment\(^{(32)}\). However, the degree of realism expected in a VR simulator has to be questioned for each scenario: if more haptic feedback,
such as somatosensations or kinematic interactions, is expected with a high degree of fidelity, too much realism for an avatar in virtual worlds can lead to anxiety and rejection, due to the uncanny valley phenomenon. According to this theory, participants react favorably to environments that are very similar or very dissimilar to reality, but are uncomfortable with intermediate realism\(^{(58,59)}\).

The affective component of learning has been described as one of the four key criteria for simulation-based learning, which is centered on the learners’ needs and for which motivation and self-efficacy are key concepts\(^{(60)}\). With this in mind, many VR simulators allow participants to replay their session, helping them recognize and analyze both their interactions and their emotions\(^{(61)}\). The emotional impact of VR simulation on self-efficacy is emphasized and appreciated by trainees\(^{(44)}\), as well as the opportunity provided by some scenarios to communicate with other disciplines before any clinical practice\(^{(47)}\) or to experience human interactions in problematic environments\(^{(51)}\). In terms of motivation, VR simulation seems to be of particular interest as it is described as a highly rated learning experience\(^{(37)}\), preferred to standard didactic lectures\(^{(46)}\), and seen as excellent preparation for clinical situations\(^{(47)}\).

Another interest of VR simulation is data generation because VR simulators can track and record every action. The data are used to give learners feedback on their performance and progress over time through their profile, allowing them to verify their skills acquisition and become proactive in their learning. But they also help educators better understand their students' learning processes, allowing them to adjust their inputs and complement their traditional teaching methods with appropriate simulations\(^{(50)}\). In addition, as most VR simulators and scenarios can be used in different cultural and geographic environments, the collected data could also be used for further intercultural studies of NTS\(^{(50)}\).
The most frequently studied NTS are interpersonal and social skills, such as teamwork and communication. As a cognitive skill, situation awareness also features frequently, as it is a crucial personal skill, especially in dynamic environments such as medical settings where it can impact decision-making and communication\(^{(62)}\). While the capacity of VR environments to recreate realistic situations makes it suitable for stress management training, none of the articles selected for this review discuss fatigue management. Even though VR is used to that end for patient-focused psychological therapy, healthcare professionals may not perceive fatigue and stress management as an issue warranting the use of simulation scenarios.

Most studies are set up to assess a simulator or scenario, reaching Kirkpatrick’s level 1 (affective reaction) or 2 (learning). According to these articles, VR simulators offer NTS training opportunities for healthcare students, as their feasibility, usability, validity, acceptability or effectiveness have been validated in different situations. However, their conclusions recommend further studies. The impact of VR simulation on NTS training still requires more systematic assessment in routine clinical practice in order to validate a possible transfer of skills for health professionals and to determine whether it achieves its ultimate goal of improving patient safety (Kirkpatrick’s level 4). This is challenging because patient safety is multifactorial, and because, as this review shows, validated tools to assess NTS are not systematically used, making large-scale comparisons difficult. Furthermore, few studies mention the inclusion of NTS training using VR simulators in the curriculum as a way of helping students progress.

To continue the development of VR systems for NTS training, four lines of research are required. First, studies are needed regarding the validation of specific NTS assessment tools for VR simulation. So far, these tools have not been validated, which may impact their evaluation in these specific environments. Second, studies are needed to estimate the different technical possibilities offered by VR technologies for NTS training, such as mixed and
augmented reality. Third, debriefing is considered a key element for skills transfer in simulation-based training. While this has been studied in different simulation contexts and with different frameworks, specific debriefing methods for VR simulation are scarce. Avatar-based debriefing, for example, could be developed for health education. Fourth, future studies should evaluate the effects of these training methods at different levels of learning: attitudes, skills, transfer of skills, and cost-benefit ratio. In particular, more studies are needed in the near future to investigate the transfer of skills to the operating room (Kirkpatrick’s level 3) and to validate VR simulation as an efficient training tool for NTS. But what is really missing is the impact of these tools on the quality of care for patients and on the overall cost of care (Kirkpatrick’s level 4), which has not yet been established.

Limitations

As our search was limited to 2 databases, there is a risk that some relevant articles were missed. The decision to select only articles written in English also excludes studies published in other languages. Our search may also have been limited by the definitions of VR and NTS, as the keywords may not have used a very specific terminology, such as *avatar*, 3-dimensional, *HMD*, mixed or augmented reality. Augmented reality, the integration of digital information into the physical world in real time, or mixed reality, the use of real objects to enhance simulations, are related to virtual environments or VR settings. Thus, some studies may use simulators based on VR technology but not specify it in their keywords. However, in order to be as comprehensive as possible for this review, the search request was replicated, replacing virtual reality with augmented and mixed reality: 58 articles were found but none of them dealt with NTS training.

Another limitation of this review is that NTS are not always defined and explicitly operationalized in studies and are sometimes concealed behind technical skills on which they are highly dependent. Finally, a limitation concerns Virtual Patient simulation, focusing on
the interpersonal social skills of healthcare professionals with their patient. It was decided that this did not come within the set of skills defined for this review. However, there is a vast literature on Virtual Patients, which are frequently used in virtual worlds and virtual immersive environments. A systematic literature review concerning the development of interpersonal social skills and communication with patients via VR could thus be examined in another paper.

Conclusion

In conclusion, VR simulation systems are a recent development in health education. The use of VR simulators has increased for technical skills training, but to a lesser extent for NTS (i.e. cognitive and interprofessional social skills). This systematic review of articles published from 2007 to 2017 shows that screen-based VR simulators or virtual worlds are the most frequently used systems, and teamwork, communication or situation awareness are the most frequently addressed NTS. The evaluation of VR systems as training tools is essential, but there has, so far, been little systematic research. The majority of studies evaluate the usability and acceptability of VR simulation, and few studies have measured the effects of VR simulation on non-technical skills development.

Nevertheless, the development of VR technologies and the portability of VR systems offer a very promising outlook for the future training of healthcare professionals. The wide range of possible scenarios that can be simulated, especially for NTS training, will undoubtedly contribute to the “successful integration of simulation throughout the fabric of healthcare”\(^{(11)}\).
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- **Identification**
  - Records identified through database searching $(n = 1373)$
  - Additional records identified through other sources $(n = 4)$

- **Screening**
  - Records after duplicates removed $(n = 188)$

- **Eligibility**
  - Records screened $(n = 1189)$
    - Records excluded $(n = 1109)$
    - Full-text articles assessed for eligibility $(n = 80)$
      - Full-text articles not available $(n = 5)$
      - Full-text articles excluded, with reasons $(n = 49)$
        - no NTS $(n = 31)$
        - no VR $(n = 15)$
        - no health professionals $(n = 2)$
        - not a study $(n = 1)$

- **Included**
  - Studies included in qualitative synthesis $(n = 26)$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>ARTICLE REFERENCES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>VIRTUAL REALITY SYSTEM</th>
<th>VR SIMULATOR</th>
<th>NON TECHNICAL SKILLS</th>
<th>OUTCOMES (KIRKPATRICK’s LEVEL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>emergency medicine</td>
<td>Cohen et al., 2013&lt;sup&gt;(41)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ambulance practitioner, surgical registrars, emergency department consultants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Second Life® + OpenSimulator</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emergency medicine</td>
<td>Greci et al., 2013&lt;sup&gt;(27)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Emergency department nurses and hospital administrators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>MUVE (Multi User Virtual Environment) using Second Life®</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emergency medicine</td>
<td>Heinrichs et al., 2010&lt;sup&gt;(43)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Physicians and nurses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>VED II (Virtual Emergency Department) an online virtual world</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emergency medicine</td>
<td>King et al., 2012&lt;sup&gt;(45)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Medicine, nursing, respiratory therapy, pharmacy, speech language pathology, diagnostic medicine sonography students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Second Life®</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emergency medicine</td>
<td>Youngblood et al., 2008&lt;sup&gt;(39)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Medical graduates and students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3D Virtual World (internet-based virtual emergency department)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health education</td>
<td>Hudson et al., 2015&lt;sup&gt;(44)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Second Life®</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health education</td>
<td>Riesen et al., 2012&lt;sup&gt;(32)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Recent graduates from nursing, paramedic, police and child and youth service programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Web.Alive™</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health education</td>
<td>Rogers, 2011&lt;sup&gt;(49)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nursing students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Second Life®</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health education</td>
<td>Sweigart et al., 2016&lt;sup&gt;(36)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Health professional students</td>
<td>VLE with avatar</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health education</td>
<td>Umoren et al., 2017&lt;sup&gt;(48)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nursing and medical students</td>
<td>VLE with avatar</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speciality</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Users</td>
<td>Simulation System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urology</td>
<td>Brewin et al., 2015(24)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Experienced and trainee urologists</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brunckhorst et al., 2015(25)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Medical students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paige et al., 2007(46)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Senior surgery resident, nurse anesthesist and circulating nurse</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shamim Khan et al., 2013(35)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Specialist registrars of different grades and urological nurses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gastroenterology</td>
<td>Dorozhkin et al., 2016(42)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Students to attending surgeons</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abelson et al., 2015(40)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Surgeons, residents and medical students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gastroenterology</td>
<td>Grover et al., 2015(28)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Novice endoscopists</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TURP Simulator (Limbs and Things©, Bristol, UK) distributed simulation environment</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uro Scopic Trainer (Limbs and Things©, Bristol, UK) + Uro MentorTM and Percmentor (Simbionix USA Corp., Cleveland, OH, USA)</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simbionix LapMentor</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uro MentorTM and Percmentor (Simbionix USA Corp., Cleveland, OH, USA)</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VEST OR Simulator (Virtual Electrosurgical Skill Trainer) with Oculus Rift HMD</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICE STORM platform (Integrated Clinical Environment; Systems, Training, Operations, Research, Methods) (Lockheed Martin Corporation, Oswego, NY)</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EndoVR endoscopy simulator (CAE Healthcare Canada, Montreal, Quebec, Canada)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialization</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Training Method</td>
<td>Simulator or Endoscopy System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gastroenterology</strong></td>
<td>Khan et al., 2017(29)</td>
<td>42 Novice endoscopists</td>
<td>X endoVR simulator (CAE Healthcare Montreal, Canada)</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laparoscopic surgery</strong></td>
<td>Maschuw et al., 2008(31)</td>
<td>40 Inexperienced and advanced surgical residents</td>
<td>X LapSim® (Surgical Science, Goteborg, Sweden)</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sankaranarayanan et al., 2016(34)</td>
<td>16 Surgeons and residents</td>
<td>X X Gen2-VR® system (HMD) and Gen1 VR (VBLaST-PT©)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vascular surgery</strong></td>
<td>Rudarakanchana et al., 2014(33)</td>
<td>32 Experienced or trainee endovascular specialists, interventional radiology trainees and assistants, interventional radiology or vascular surgery consultants, scrub nurses and radiographers</td>
<td>X (VIST)-C, Mentice, Gothenburg, Sweden</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willaert et al., 2011(37)</td>
<td>20 Junior medical residents</td>
<td>X AngioMentorExpress® (Simbionix USA Corp., Cleveland, OH, USA)</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cardiology</strong></td>
<td>Khanal et al., 2014(30)</td>
<td>14 Certified clinicians</td>
<td>X Second Life®</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cardiopulmonary resuscitation</strong></td>
<td>Creutzfeldt et al., 2010(26)</td>
<td>12 Medical students</td>
<td>X Multiplayer virtual world (OLIVE, SAIC inc.)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orthopedic surgery</strong></td>
<td>Wucherer et al., 2015(38)</td>
<td>19 Junior surgeons</td>
<td>X VR surgical procedural simulator</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post Anesthesia Care Unit (PACU)</strong></td>
<td>White et al., 2015(47)</td>
<td>43 Nurses</td>
<td>X 2 Virtual Humans displayed on 2 screens (Wizard of Oz setup: converse with trainee)</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. N= Number of participants. Virtual reality system is coded : SB : Simulation-based virtual reality simulator ; VW : virtual world ; IVE : Immersive virtual environment.

Non technical skills are coded : SA : Situation awareness ; DM : Decision making ; COM : Communication ; TW : Teamwork ; LDS : Leadership ; SM : Stress management ; FM : Fatigue management.
**Abelson et al., 2015**

- Determine feasibility of creating a VR operating room
- Evaluate simulator for face and construct validity

**Outcome Measures**

- Construct validity: metric data
- Face validity: Likert-scale questionnaires (realism, inclination to use), Bedford Workload Scale and modified NASA-TASK Load Index scale

**Main Findings**

- Training environment evaluated as realistic
- 82% of participants felt low workload or had enough spare capacity for additional tasks. All participants had minimal mental, physical, and temporal demand and none reported requiring a high amount of effort to complete the simulation
- No statistically significant difference between attendings and trainees for all responses

**Brewin et al., 2015**

- Assess validity of distributed simulation environment for NTS training
- Evaluate educational impact

**Outcome Measures**

- Face, content and construct validity: questionnaires
- NOTECHS
- Educational impact: questionnaires completed after the simulations

**Main Findings**

- Good learning environment for NTS, judged realistic
- NTS of experienced urologists significantly better than trainees establishing construct validity
- All trainees felt more confident
- Kirkpatrick level 1 evidence and indirect evidence of learning (Kirkpatrick level 2)

**Brunckhorst et al., 2015**

- Evaluate feasibility, acceptability, content validity and educational impact of simulation-based curriculum integrating NTS

**Outcome Measures**

- NOTSS
- Content validity: post-study questionnaire

**Main Findings**

- 100 % of experts agreed integration of full immersion simulation was a useful tool for teaching non-technical skills
- Curriculum-trained group: significantly higher NOTSS scores than control group
- Feasibility of delivery of the curriculum was rated 9.27/10, enjoyment and productivity was scored at 9/10, difficulty of curriculum rated 4.93/10

**Cohen et al., 2013**

- Determine feasibility and reliability of skills assessment

**Outcome Measures**

- 7-point NTS competency scale for paramedics and T-NOTECHS (Trauma Non-Technical Skills Scale)

**Main Findings**

- Significant and strong correlations between expert assessors suggest reliability to carry out NTS assessments in virtual environments in major incident scenarios
- No significant correlations between expert and self-assessment for NTS

**Creutzfeldt et al., 2010**

- Evaluate (SA) Situation Awareness self-assessment instrument
- Analyze SA training in virtual settings

**Outcome Measures**

- SA: 9-items questionnaire + trainee’s own opinion of his or her SA during training
- Concentration/attention: 10-items instrument

**Main Findings**

- SA increased from the first to the last scenario
- Perception of SA corresponded to calculated SA
- Correlation between SA and concentration

**Dorozhkin et al., 2016**

- Establish face validity, usefulness and fidelity of virtual OR fire training

**Outcome Measures**

- Perceived usefulness and face validity: questionnaire

**Main Findings**

- Face validity established with high degree of satisfaction and usefulness
- 33/49 participants preferred this modality of training over a traditional one
- 47% of subjects offered suggestions on how to make the simulator look and feel more realistic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greci et al., 2013&lt;sup&gt;(27)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Develop and evaluate a virtual learning curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grover et al., 2015&lt;sup&gt;(28)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Validate a simulation-based curriculum for cognitive and integrative competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinrichs et al., 2010&lt;sup&gt;(43)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Determine efficiency of a Virtual Emergency Department to train mass-casualty incidents (team skills)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson et al., 2015&lt;sup&gt;(44)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Examine perceived usability of Second Life (SL) as an immersive virtual environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan et al., 2017&lt;sup&gt;(29)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Evaluate effectiveness of a simulation-based training curriculum of NTS on novice endoscopists’ performance of clinical colonoscopy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Module in VEST Simulator**

- Open-ended questions: technical challenges, course content, immersion
- Interviews and focus groups

**Open-ended questions and preferences**

- All students improved postcourse disaster preparedness knowledge scores
- Emerging themes: team communication, team planning, team decision making
- Functioning in an unfamiliar environment was evaluated as requiring similar skills as during a disaster where rapid decision making with incomplete information

**Global performance**

- Integrated Scenario Global Rating Form (ISGRF)
- Communication skills: Communication Global Rating Scale (CGRS)

**Situation awareness**

- questionnaire with 27 items

**Perceived usability**

- System Usability Scale (SUS)
- questionnaire with 27 items

**Evaluation**

- To inform the potential implementation of NTS into postgraduate gastrointestinal curricula, non-technical performance will be determined by comparing the scores from the M-OSANTS, ISGRF, ISCRF and GSE for both conditions and at 3 different times
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khanal et al., 2014&lt;sup&gt;(30)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Self Efficacy Scale (GSE)</td>
<td>Evaluate efficacy of delivering advanced cardiac life support (ACLS) using a virtual reality simulator. Team performance: electronic checklist based on ACSL guidelines assessed by experts. Final questionnaire on training experience. No statistically significant difference in improvement of skills between groups. VR-based ACLS training simulator is significantly cheaper, easier to organize, and facilitates users to practice in a team from disparate locations without requiring an evaluator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King et al., 2012&lt;sup&gt;(45)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate usability of the environment. Evaluate learning effectiveness of scenarios. Evaluate integration into curriculum. Trainee performance assessment based on ACSL guidelines assessed by experts. Debriefing: exploration of team interactions. Satisfaction survey and questions on learning in the environment. Students appreciated to visualize the Emergency Room setting in a low-pressure situation. It provided students with opportunities to communicate with other disciplines, which they would not have had until in clinical practice. Students felt it was great preparation for non-virtual scenarios for clinical situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maschuwu et al., 2008&lt;sup&gt;(31)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Self Efficacy (GSE) score. Technical metrics: time, economy of motion and damage parameters.</td>
<td>Explore impact of self-belief of surgeons on laparoscopic performance using a VR simulator. No significant differences were found in gender or in GSE score between both groups. Motions of advanced trainees were more economic than novices, but no significant difference in time, error score and right instrument movements. Novices GSE scores negatively correlates with economy of motion and time, while for advanced residents it is independent of laparoscopic performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paige et al., 2007&lt;sup&gt;(46)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teamwork assessment: communication, coordination and situational awareness. Questionnaire on perception of training effectiveness and specific attributes of teamwork.</td>
<td>Evaluate perception of simulated scenarios. Evaluate effectiveness for communication and teamwork during OR crisis. Sessions were found effective/very effective for improving teamwork, communication and recognizing problems in the OR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riesen et al., 2012&lt;sup&gt;(32)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-perceived changes in interprofessional attitudes and competence: IEPS, ICCAS. Team performance assessment: TOSCE. Students perceptions: program assessment tool, and 16-item questionnaire.</td>
<td>Improve interprofessional competencies. Determine acceptability of a blended learning environment. Significant differences pre and post workshop were found in ICCAS and IEPS scores. Significant improvement across the 3 simulations in all competencies. Program and learning experience were highly rated. Learner confidence and performance can be improved through education delivered in a virtual environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers, 2011&lt;sup&gt;(49)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>• Investigate how a simulation in Second Life can encourage teamwork and collaborative problem solving</td>
<td>• Individual interviews: clinical judgement, teamwork and interpersonal skills</td>
<td>• Critical Life simulation is an artificial social structure where problem-based scenarios can be created</td>
<td>Students can co-construct mental models expericencering human interaction in problematic environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudarakanchana et al., 2014&lt;sup&gt;(33)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>• Evaluate feasibility of integration of a VR simulator in an immersive simulation</td>
<td>• Questionnaires: realism (face validity) and potential for use in team training for both technical and human factor skills</td>
<td>Experienced team leaders were significantly faster than trainees</td>
<td>Realism of the environment was scored very high and realism of the VR simulator was rated high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sankaranarayanan et al., 2016&lt;sup&gt;(34)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>• Establish face and construct validity of an immersive VR system</td>
<td>• 5-point Likert-scale subjective feedback questionnaire: realism, immersive experience, and effects of distractions and interruptions</td>
<td>Performance decreased with added distractions and interruptions</td>
<td>Subjects rated interruptions very high in their ability to affect performance and music distraction received the lowest mean rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamim Khan et al., 2013&lt;sup&gt;(35)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>• Establish feasibility and acceptability of simulation training for NTS</td>
<td>• Interviews: perception of simulated environment Feasability, acceptability and construct validity: questionnaires</td>
<td>Construct-validity established: Seniors performed significantly better than junior trainees in all simulation sessions</td>
<td>Increased cognitive load for trainees on VR simulator: pressure/anxiety about the unknown and interplay between technical and non-technical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweigart et al., 2016&lt;sup&gt;(36)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>• Test utility and acceptability of a virtual learning environment (VLE)</td>
<td>• Effectiveness: TeamSTEPPS -TAQ (Teamwork Attitude Questionnaire) Utility: Time to complete scenarios and answers to questions within scenarios Acceptability: Likert-scale type questions</td>
<td>Positive student feedback on ease of use and perceived effectiveness for teaching communication and professionalism</td>
<td>Scores on the T-TAQ revealed significant positive changes in leadership, situation monitoring, mutual support, and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umoren et al., 2017 (48)</td>
<td>Propose an introduction to TeamSTEPPS communication tools for nursing and medical students. MCQ questions during the progression of the scenarios: designation of a TeamSTEPPS strategy, identification of a missing component of this strategy and possible selection of another strategy. Learner recognition of the SBAR communication tool was high across groups. Knowledge of which component of SBAR was missing was lower across groups. Students demonstrated increased correct recognition of strategies as they progressed through the scenarios. When they had the choice, students were more likely to chose the Two-Challenge Rule than the CUS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White et al., 2015 (47)</td>
<td>Study quality of information transfer and teamwork during a simulated critical event. Assess gathering and sharing of critical information. Communication skills: Critical Patient Information checklist and Interprofessional Communication Skills checklist. A substantial percentage of participants did not share 3 critical items and 87% of the participants missed a dosage error. Items on Communication Checklist were missed by a substantial number of participants (introduction of self and task, closed-loop communication). No statistically significant relationship between scores and years of nursing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willaert et al., 2011 (37)</td>
<td>Evaluate whether a part-task rehearsal of a surgical procedure on a VR simulator is as effective as a full-task one. Non-technical skills: NOTSS. Face validity and usefulness: questionnaire. Emotional, cognitive and physical stress: short version of State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) questionnaire. Both groups scored acceptable scores in all categories of NOTSS. Simulated procedure was found highly realistic. Simulation helped participants in decision-making, confidence, reduction of anxiety, and communication. Both strategies were as effective on stress levels. For a moderately difficult case, a part-task patient specific VR rehearsal is as effective as a full-task one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wucherer et al., 2015 (38)</td>
<td>Measure usability of simulator. Explore relationship between mental workload and surgical performance during crisis. Cognitive workload: 3-item questionnaire and Surgery Task Load Index (SURG-TLX). Questionnaire: face validity and training value. Training resulted in a decrease of time, but significantly slower performances when crises. The more workload was experienced, the poorer was the surgical performance. Telephone call seemed more disturbing compared to patient discomfort.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngblood et al., 2008 (39)</td>
<td>Evaluate VLE for leadership and trauma management by comparing users' experience with a Leadership skills: EMCRM (Emergency Medicine Crisis Resource Management) scale. All participants evaluated simulation as “useful” or “very useful” to assess and manage trauma patients in Emergency Department (ED). All participants showed significant improvement in team leadership. Students emphasized emotional impact of simulation in VLE. Both mannequin-based and VLE simulation of ED cases are valid training methods to improve EMCRM team leadership skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high-fidelity patient simulator (PS)</td>
<td>• Assessment of learning experience: debriefing and questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>