

The Effect of Expert Patient Simulation on Clinical Judgement: A Quasi-Experimental Study [Letter]

Vaishnav Krishna¹, Parmis Vafapour², Syeda Anum Zahra³

¹Medical University of Plovdiv, Plovdiv, Bulgaria; ²Barts and the London School of Medicine and Dentistry (QMUL), London, UK; ³Imperial NHS Trust, London, UK

Correspondence: Vaishnav Krishna, Medical University of Plovdiv, Plovdiv, Bulgaria, Email contactvaishnavk@gmail.com

Dear editor

We have assessed the paper by Shinde et al¹ titled “Effect of Expert Patient Simulation on Clinical Judgement: A Quasi-Experimental Study” and express gratitude for their findings. As UK and Bulgarian medical students and junior doctor, we offer our perspectives.

While the study addresses clinical judgement skills (CJS), it overlooks key roles within the multidisciplinary team (MDT), limiting real-world applicability. The omission of doctors, physician associates, physiotherapists, and others hampers CJS practicality, as MDT decisions are predominant. Solely conducted at Mizan-Tepi University, the study’s scope curtails broader relevance, undermining external validity. Replicating this research across global universities could enhance comprehensiveness and reproducibility.

The study’s 8-week duration impedes understanding of long-term CJS effects and their real-world transferability. Notably absent is scrutiny of practical application and sustained retention in authentic clinical and patient settings. Moreover, the resource-intensive nature of expert patient simulation, involving trained midwives and multimedia, poses challenges to widespread implementation, particularly in resource-scarce environments.

The Hawthorne effect introduces variability in participant performance, potentially amplifying or diminishing results. Observed participants might strive to excel or feel embarrassed, thereby influencing their performance. This phenomenon can inflate CJS assessment outcomes, evident in statistical differences (mean difference 2.28, $t = 9.13$, $p < 0.001$), self-confidence improvement ($W = 1$, $Z = -3.57$, $p < 0.001$), and a positive correlation [$r = 0.419$, $p = 0.004$] between observation and performance. Mitigation strategies such as blinding or impartial assessors could counteract this effect.

The study also bears the risk of response bias, given its reliance on self-reported self-confidence scores and potentially biased feedback from involved midwives and nurses. Employing uniform assessment by impartial parties could alleviate such subjectivity. Exploring AI-based assessment tools holds promise for enhancing feedback objectivity.

In conclusion, Shinde et al¹ research showcases effective outcomes of patient simulation on clinical judgement, albeit within a limited scope encompassing nursing and midwifery staff. Challenges stemming from participant and location constraints persist. Investigator involvement introduces potential response bias. We urge the project’s expansion, potentially involving independent investigators to address these limitations. We commend the authors for their invaluable contributions to medical education.

Disclosure

The authors report no conflicts of interest in this communication.

Reference

1. Shinde S, Tiruneh F, Fufa DA. The effect of expert patient simulation on clinical judgment: a Quasi-Experimental Study. *Adv Med Educ Pract*. 2023;14:783–790. doi:10.2147/AMEP.S402610

Dove Medical Press encourages responsible, free and frank academic debate. The content of the Advances in Medical Education and Practice 'letters to the editor' section does not necessarily represent the views of Dove Medical Press, its officers, agents, employees, related entities or the Advances in Medical Education and Practice editors. While all reasonable steps have been taken to confirm the content of each letter, Dove Medical Press accepts no liability in respect of the content of any letter, nor is it responsible for the content and accuracy of any letter to the editor.

Advances in Medical Education and Practice

Dovepress

Publish your work in this journal

Advances in Medical Education and Practice is an international, peer-reviewed, open access journal that aims to present and publish research on Medical Education covering medical, dental, nursing and allied health care professional education. The journal covers undergraduate education, postgraduate training and continuing medical education including emerging trends and innovative models linking education, research, and health care services. The manuscript management system is completely online and includes a very quick and fair peer-review system. Visit <http://www.dovepress.com/testimonials.php> to read real quotes from published authors.

Submit your manuscript here: <http://www.dovepress.com/advances-in-medical-education-and-practice-journal>

<https://doi.org/10.2147/AMEP.S436527>