

# 1 Virtual Simulated Placements in Healthcare Education: A scoping review

## 2 Authors

3 Juliana Samson<sup>1</sup> Marc Gilbey<sup>2</sup> Natasha Taylor<sup>3</sup> Rosie Kneafsey<sup>4</sup>

- 4 1. Coventry University, Research Centre for Healthcare and Communities
- 5 2. Coventry University, Research Centre for Healthcare and Communities
- 6 3. Coventry University, School of Nursing, Midwifery and Health
- 7 4. Coventry University, Research Centre for Healthcare and Communities

## 10 Abstract

11 **Introduction** A virtual simulated placement (VSP) is a computer-generated version of a  
12 practice placement. COVID-19 drove increased adoption of virtual technology in clinical  
13 education. Accordingly, the number of VSP publications increased from 2020. This review  
14 aims to determine the scope of this literature to inform future research questions.

15 **Objective** Assess the range and types of evidence related to VSPs across the healthcare  
16 professions.

17 **Inclusion criteria** Studies that focussed on healthcare students participating in VSPs.  
18 Hybrid, augmented reality (AR) and mixed reality (MR) placements were excluded.

19 **Methods** Fourteen databases were searched, limited to English, and dated from 1<sup>st</sup> January  
20 2020. Supplementary searches were employed, and an updated search was conducted on  
21 9<sup>th</sup> July 2023. Themes were synthesised using the PAGER framework to highlight patterns,  
22 advances, gaps, evidence for practice and research recommendations.

23 **Results** Twenty-eight papers were reviewed. All VSPs were designed in response to  
24 pandemic restrictions. Students were primarily from medicine and nursing. Few publications  
25 were from developing nations. There was limited stakeholder involvement in the VSP  
26 designs and a lack of robust research designs, consistent outcome measures, conceptual  
27 underpinnings, and immersive technologies. Despite this, promising trends for student  
28 experience, knowledge, communication, and critical thinking skills using VSPs have  
29 emerged.

30 **Conclusion.** This review maps the VSP evidence across medicine, nursing, midwifery and  
31 allied health. Before a systematic review is feasible across healthcare, allied health and  
32 midwifery research require greater representation. Based on the highlighted gaps, other  
33 areas for future research are suggested.

## 34 Keywords

35 Technology; Students; Learning; Virtual reality; Review

36

37

38

#### WHAT IS ALREADY KNOWN ON THIS TOPIC

- Digital placements in undergraduate nursing and medicine have been studied in one existing systematic review, providing evidence that learning outcomes for knowledge and practice were equivalent to traditional placements.
- VSPs are a subset of digital placements that are computer-generated. With the increasing trend towards VSPs, an updated scoping review across a wider range of professions was justified.

#### WHAT THIS STUDY ADDS

- Scoping the literature on VSPs across healthcare for undergraduate and postgraduate students, provides a map across professions, specialities, countries, designs, content, and outcomes.

#### HOW THIS STUDY MIGHT AFFECT RESEARCH, PRACTICE OR POLICY

- Gaps in allied health and midwifery VSP research highlight populations of focus. Future VSPs should consider Interprofessional Education (IPE) and resource sharing with developing countries. The benefits of immersive technologies are yet to be considered, and improvements to VSP design and research methodology are recommended.

39

## 40 **Introduction**

41 Practice placements are important activities in the training of healthcare students. They  
42 promote the application of knowledge to a practical setting for developing the skills, attitudes  
43 and behaviours expected of a healthcare professional [1-3]. Placements allow active  
44 involvement in care delivery under supervision, and the opportunity to receive feedback on  
45 student performance [4]. In other words, student learning on placement is contextualised to  
46 future practice.

47 Simulation-based education is an alternative to traditional practice placements. In traditional  
48 placements, students enter a workplace and learn through observation and participation in  
49 actual clinical events. In contrast, healthcare simulation is a technique that produces a  
50 scenario designed to represent a real-life practice situation for experiential learning [5-6].  
51 Compared with traditional placements, simulation can ensure that low-frequency and high-  
52 risk cases or situations receive sufficient practice in a safe space, without mistakes causing  
53 harm to real persons [7]. Thus, the advantage of simulation is the ability to control and direct  
54 case-based learning.

55 With technological advances, simulation-based education has expanded into virtual  
56 environments. Technology innovation accelerated during the pandemic, and healthcare  
57 training must keep pace with continued advances [8-9]. The increasing complexity of  
58 healthcare, with developments in science and technology, will require the future workforce to  
59 be agile, lifelong learners, with the ability to substitute skills across professions [10-12].

60 Using virtual simulated environments could provide students with the opportunity to support  
61 these aims.

62 A VSP is defined in this research as a computer-generated version of a practice placement.  
63 Considering the importance of practice placements, the advantages of simulation-based  
64 learning and the recent advances in technology, this topic is relevant for review.

65

## 66 Background for the Scoping Review

67 A preliminary search of MEDLINE, the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews and  
68 Joanna Briggs Institute Evidence Synthesis was conducted on 17<sup>th</sup> June 2022 to locate any  
69 existing or underway reviews on the topic. A systematic review [13] was identified, focused  
70 on digital placements for undergraduate nursing and medical students. The review also  
71 included non-computer-generated experiences such as telemedicine and on-screen role-  
72 play rather than being restricted to VSPs. Whilst sixteen studies were located in their search  
73 in April 2021, the increased trend towards implementing computer-generated placements  
74 (VSPs) within undergraduate and postgraduate programmes across the wider health  
75 professions justifies the current review.

76 As VSPs are an emerging field, mapping the literature across healthcare and analysing gaps  
77 are recommended before more specific research questions are defined [14-16]. Therefore, a  
78 scoping review method was selected to conduct a broader search across medical, nursing,  
79 midwifery, and allied healthcare, for undergraduate and postgraduate students who  
80 undertook VSPs. The objective is to assess the range and types of evidence related to  
81 VSPs, across the healthcare professions. It was hypothesised that mapping the literature  
82 regarding VSPs across healthcare might highlight innovations in one speciality that could be  
83 applied to another. Sufficient research in a specific area may underline the requirement for a  
84 systematic review, and conversely, gaps in the literature could justify new research areas.

85

## 86 **Methods**

87 This study followed the stages detailed in a framework for scoping reviews [14]:

- 88 1. Identify the research question
- 89 2. Identify relevant studies
- 90 3. Study selection
- 91 4. Charting the data
- 92 5. Collating, summarising, and reporting the results

93 An a-priori protocol used the Joanna Briggs Institute template for scoping reviews [16] and  
94 was registered with the Open Science Framework (DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/AY5GH) [17]. The  
95 PRISMA-ScR checklist (see online supplemental file A1) ensured methodological rigour  
96 when reporting this review [18].

## 97 Review Questions

- 98 1. What is the scope of the literature relating to VSPs for healthcare students?  
99
- 100 2. What outcomes are reported in relation to the students undertaking VSPs?

101

102 Relevant Studies

103 The eligibility criteria are tabled below using the SPIDER [19] and PCC [16] formats:

	Inclusion	Exclusion
S (sample) or Population	Papers studying undergraduate and postgraduate healthcare students, from Nursing, Midwifery and Allied Health.	Papers studying professions outside of the target group
P.I. (phenomenon of interest) or Concept and Context	Virtual simulation learning in a practice placement.  Articles should stipulate that it is a placement / clerkship / elective / selective / practical / practicum in the curriculum.	Onsite simulation  Augmented reality (AR) and mixed reality (MR) interventions.  Contact with real or standardised patients, even if telecast to students or delivered in a virtual simulation suite  Hybrid/blended approaches (part online, part onsite)  Tutorials training isolated clinical skills and case studies.  Theory-based education  Assessment of learning
D (design)	Studies with quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods.	N/a
E (evaluation)	At least one student centred outcome is included (e.g., student satisfaction, confidence, self-efficacy, engagement, learning, knowledge, attitude, skills, or clinical performance)	No student-centred outcomes recorded.
R (research type)	Any primary research, including grey literature. In English language and published since 1 <sup>st</sup> January 2020	Reviews - although primary studies will be extracted from relevant reviews to determine their eligibility.  Study protocols, expert opinion, discussion papers, letters, comments, editorials, and book chapters.  Survey research (without a VSP case)

Table 1: Eligibility criteria in PCC and SPIDER formats

104 The selection criteria were piloted by screening 50 titles and abstracts. This process  
105 generated 94% agreement between two reviewers (JS & MG) and served to clarify the  
106 selection criteria. In discussion with a 3rd reviewer (NT), the Health and Care Professions  
107 Council (HCPC) definition for allied health [20] was adopted in place of the NHS criteria [21].  
108 This was decided because the HCPC definition includes practitioner psychologists. It was  
109 reasoned that psychology students might form a population well suited to VSPs, with the  
110 treatment emphasis on talking therapies.

111

## 112 Search strategy

113 An initial limited search of MEDLINE and CINAHL was undertaken on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2022 to  
114 identify articles on the topic. The text words contained in the titles and abstracts of relevant  
115 articles and index terms were used to develop a full search strategy. This was checked by a  
116 healthcare research librarian and run on MEDLINE on 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2022 (see online  
117 supplemental file A2). The search strategy was then adapted for each database. The  
118 databases searched included MEDLINE, CINAHL, AMED, Cochrane Database, PsychINFO,  
119 ERIC, SCOPUS, ScienceDirect and Biomed Central. Grey literature sources include  
120 PubMed, EThOS, ProQuest (dissertations), Google Scholar and IEEE Xplore. Searches  
121 were limited to English language and dated from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2020. The date limitation was  
122 justified given that VSP research has essentially emerged post-pandemic.

123 Supplementary search strategies were employed using existing knowledge and networks,  
124 contacting relevant organisations, hand searching journals and checking the reference list of  
125 all included sources and relevant reviews. Advances in Simulation, British Medical Journal:  
126 Simulation and Technology Enhanced Learning (BMJ STEL) and Clinical Simulation in  
127 Nursing were hand searched. These supplementary searches were conducted by one  
128 reviewer (JS) and checked by another (NT).

129 An updated database search was conducted on the 9<sup>th</sup> of July 2023. A second reviewer  
130 (MG) checked the title/abstract and full text selection decisions. Registries (Clinical  
131 Trials.gov WHO ICTRP and the Cochrane Database) were searched for additional papers  
132 [25]. Updated hand searches were performed in Advances in Simulation and Clinical  
133 Simulation in Nursing (BMJ STEL had since discontinued). A second reviewer (NT) checked  
134 these supplementary searches.

135

## 136 Source Selection

137 Following the database searches, all identified citations were uploaded into Endnote [22],  
138 and duplicates were removed. Each potential duplicate was confirmed separately, rather  
139 than using batch automation to prevent the removal of false positives [23]. The citations  
140 were exported to Rayyan and re-checked for any missed duplicates [24].

141 Once the pilot screening was complete, the remaining titles/abstracts were screened  
142 independently by two reviewers against the revised criteria, and potentially relevant sources  
143 were retrieved in full text. These were assessed in detail against the inclusion criteria by two  
144 independent reviewers (JS & MG), blinded in Rayyan. 100% agreement was reached  
145 between the reviewers through discussion. Further details of the source selection, including  
146 a list of references excluded at full text screening are detailed in online supplemental file A3.

## 147 Data Charting

148 A Microsoft Excel spreadsheet was used as a data charting tool to standardise obtaining  
149 information from the papers. Two independent reviewers conducted a pilot of five included  
150 papers to assess the utility of the information charted and generate emerging themes.  
151 Consensus was reached between reviewers (JS & MG) on the charting method, and  
152 modifications were made to the spreadsheet, to improve the quality of charted data (see  
153 online supplemental file A4). Following this, one reviewer (JS) charted the remaining data,  
154 which was checked by another (NT).

155 A table of included study characteristics was collated, and numerical analysis in Microsoft  
156 Excel was undertaken to provide descriptive statistics. The size of the data set was  
157 manageable enough to organise findings across the PAGER domains (patterns, advances,  
158 gaps, evidence for practice and research recommendations) [26], for synthesis, without the  
159 use of NVIVO software (as was planned in the protocol).

160

## 161 Results

162 The search results and selection process are reported in the Preferred Reporting Items for  
163 Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram (Figure 1):

164

Figure 1: PRISMA chart. Modified from [27]

The characteristics of the twenty-eight included papers are summarised in online supplemental file A5 and the PAGER themes are summarised in Table 2:

Patterns	Advances	Gaps	Evidence for Practice	Research Recommendations
Publications from developed countries (see Figure 2)	Innovations occurred mostly in countries with resources to support VSP development	Few publications from the developing world	VSPs can be delivered remotely and are scalable (useful for supporting training in the developing world)	Sharing resources across countries and overcoming barriers such as internet connectivity or access to devices
Narrow profession focus	All VSPs occurred within single profession silos  Student populations were mostly medical / nursing	No Interprofessional education (IPE)  No allied health representation	Support for VSPs delivering on improved discipline specific skills	The development of IPE VSPs to train collaborative capabilities  Allied health groups could inform future IPE VSPs
Pandemic Response	Rapid innovation to shift from in-person placement to VSPs in response to COVID-19 restrictions.	Research planned under time pressure may explain the lack of robust experimental design and conceptual frameworks	Positive outcomes suggest that VSPs could be utilised beyond the pandemic response	With less time pressure, future research could consider conceptual frameworks, with more robust experimental designs
Stakeholder involvement in the VSP design	Most studies involved university faculty. Others also included clinicians.	Few incorporated student input and consultation. No evidence of co-creation.	Design that involves student participation throughout the process better serves the end user needs	Participatory research designs should include all stakeholders, including students and service users (who ultimately benefit)
Use of generic platforms and screen-based delivery	Platforms such as Microsoft Teams, Zoom and existing Learning Management Systems (LMS) were used to facilitate VSP delivery	Limited use of bespoke healthcare education software or use of virtual reality (VR). No headsets or haptics. No conversational Artificial Intelligence (AI).	Student feedback frequently rated the live interaction with facilitators positively	Future research could test live interaction with bespoke VR software. Headsets and haptic research may emerge as devices become more ubiquitous
A focus on case-based learning	VSPs were oriented towards clinical cases and the development of knowledge, clinical reasoning, decision making and communication	Practical skills training was rare. Few featured social determinants of health / community interventions	Evidence for improved knowledge, clinical thinking, and communication skills from VSP interventions	Hybrid approaches are currently more suitable for practical skills but haptics in VR may feature as technology improves. Community interventions link well with IPE
Survey based outcome measures	Most VSPs were evaluated through custom designed surveys and student marks	Few validated outcome measure scales or standardised examinations	Evaluations were overall positive and improvements in test scores were equivalent to in-person cohorts	Validated outcome measures and standardised tests in future trials would provide more robust data for meta-analysis

Table 2: PAGER Framework Themes Summary



Key patterns and gaps are mapped across all included studies in Table 3:

Citation	Patterns				Gaps							
	Developed Nation	Medical or Nursing Profession	Pandemic Response	Generic Software	Population		Experimental Design		Students involved in the design	Conceptual Frameworks	Software Bespoke software	Hardware VR equipment
					IPE	Allied Health	Comparator group	Pre & post measures				
[28]	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓					
[29]	✓	✓	✓	✓						✓		
[30]	✓	✓	✓	✓						✓	✓	
[31]	✓	✓	✓	✓							✓	
[32]	✓	✓	✓	✓							✓	
[33]	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓			✓		
[34]			✓	✓				✓		✓		
[35]	✓	✓	✓	✓							✓	
[36]		✓	✓	✓								
[37]	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓			
[38]	✓	✓	✓	✓							✓	
[39]	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		✓		
[40]	✓	✓	✓	✓						✓	✓	
[41]		✓	✓	✓				✓		✓	✓	

Citation (cont'd)	Patterns				Gaps							
	Developed Nation	Medical or Nursing Profession	Pandemic Response	Generic Software	Population		Experimental Design		Students involved in the design	Conceptual Frameworks	Software Bespoke software	Hardware VR equipment
					IPE	Allied Health	Comparator group	Pre & post measu res				
[42]	✓	✓	✓	✓								
[43]	✓	✓	✓	✓						✓		
[44]	✓	✓	✓	✓					✓		✓	
[45]	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓			✓	✓	
[46]	✓	✓	✓	✓						✓	✓	
[47]	✓	✓	✓	✓							✓	
[48]	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓			
[49]	✓		✓	✓		✓				✓	✓	
[50]	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓	
[51]	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓				✓	
[52]	✓	✓	✓	✓						✓	✓	
[53]	✓	✓	✓	✓							✓	
[54]	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓		✓		
[55]		✓	✓	✓			✓			✓	✓	

Table 3: Key patterns and gaps

## Countries of origin

168

Most of the included papers were published in developed countries. The global distribution of publications is illustrated (in Figure 2).

Figure 2: Country of origin of included papers

Countries defined as developing by the OECD [56]

170 **Range of Professions**

171 The literature was predominantly medical and nursing research, constituting 93% of the  
172 included papers. The distribution by profession and breakdowns by specialty are illustrated  
173 in online supplemental file A6. Diagnostic radiology rotations were the most prevalent VSPs  
174 in Medicine, and Paediatrics in Nursing.

175 **Pandemic Response**

176 All the VSPs in the included papers were developed in response to COVID-19 restrictions,  
177 which discontinued face to face (FTF) practice placements.

178 **Experimental Designs**

179 The most basic study design was a single group, with a post-intervention measure, featuring  
180 in sixteen papers. Seven papers compared measures pre- and post-intervention. Five  
181 papers compared VSP outcomes to a previous cohort of students who completed FTF  
182 placements pre-pandemic.

183 **Stakeholder involvement**

184 Practice partners (clinicians working in practice) were involved in the course development  
185 with faculty in eight studies [29, 32, 37, 41, 44, 48, 50, 55] and students were involved in  
186 four. Three studies developed a needs assessment from student surveys [34, 43, 52]. None  
187 involved service users.

188 **Conceptual Frameworks**

189 Conceptual underpinnings include pedagogy, theoretical frameworks, and professional  
190 standards. Although no single paper covered all elements, underpinning concepts are  
191 evident across the literature, summarised in online supplemental file A7.

192 **Software**

193 All studies used generic software such as Zoom or Microsoft Teams for screen-based  
194 communication, and many used existing learning management systems to host files and  
195 activities. Others adopted commercial software applications, allowing students to conduct a  
196 history by selecting from a menu of interview questions. None used conversational AI  
197 (computer-generated conversation, assisted by artificial intelligence). Some applications  
198 presented VR patient avatars with which the student could direct a physical examination,  
199 although this was delivered via a screen [31, 38, 40-41, 51] and one study provided an  
200 interactive community setting in screen-based VR [53]. All software resources are outlined in  
201 online supplemental file A8.

202 **Intended learning outcomes**

203 The focus of most VSPs were clinical cases, through which knowledge, clinical reasoning,  
204 decision making, and communication skills were developed. Skill learning was generally  
205 visualised through virtual patient encounters and instructional/walk-through procedure  
206 videos. The social determinants of health were the focus in two studies [50, 53] and another  
207 facilitated student in teaching roles [42].

208

209 Outcomes

210 The most common outcome measures were custom developed student evaluation  
 211 questionnaires, followed by exam marks. Custom questionnaires provided positive feedback  
 212 for student experience, satisfaction, and usability, although some technical issues and zoom  
 213 fatigue were cited [31, 50]. Three papers reported a 100% pass rate on their VSPs [35, 49,  
 214 52], and four used a standardised exam to demonstrate comparable outcomes with FTF  
 215 cohorts [45, 51], or the national average [30, 32].

216 Table 4 summarises the outcomes of research that employed a repeated measures design  
 217 or group comparisons.

Study feature	Outcomes	Papers
Measures compared pre and post VSP	Increase in self-rated competencies	[37] [39] [54]
	Increase in knowledge scores	[34] [48] [50]
	Improvement in interview skills	[34]
	Improvement in critical thinking ability	[41]
Comparison between a VSP group and a previous cohort that attended a FTF placement	No significant difference in exam scores between groups ( $p > 0.05$ )	[45] [51] [55]
	Mixed outcomes from survey responses	[33] [28]

218 Table 4: Outcomes from intra/inter group comparisons

219 When measures were compared pre- and post-VSP, there was a trend of improvement in  
 220 self-rated competencies, knowledge scores and critical thinking skills. However, when the  
 221 comparison is made with traditional FTF placements, the pattern is less clear. There were no  
 222 differences in grades when post-VSP exam scores were compared with previous cohorts'  
 223 who attended a FTF placement pre-pandemic. Student satisfaction was comparable in a  
 224 study conducted in medical general practice, but professional exchange and learning scored  
 225 higher in the VSP, while the attainment of new skills and attitudes scored higher in the FTF  
 226 placement [33]. One paper compared students who participated in virtual readouts (the  
 227 radiology equivalent of patient rounds) with students who attended workplace readouts pre-  
 228 pandemic [28]. The educational value was comparable in survey results, though students on  
 229 the VSP rated slightly higher for perceived interaction. That FTF students were mostly  
 230 observing on their placement might explain this finding. Conversely, FTF students had  
 231 greater confidence in using the workstations, considered the case because the VSP  
 232 students were unable to operate PACS workstations remotely.

## 233 Discussion

### 234 Outcomes and Research designs

235 The pattern of positive student evaluation, improvement from baseline measures post VSP,  
236 and equivalence in exam scores, compared with in-person cohorts, appears promising.  
237 However, these results should be interpreted with caution. The objective of a scoping review  
238 is to map the literature for patterns and gaps, rather than in-depth appraisal of the quality of  
239 the papers. The findings compare with a systematic review that examined digital clinical  
240 education more broadly [13]. Standalone digital education was reported to be as effective as  
241 conventional learning for knowledge and practice, in nursing and medicine. However, there  
242 are some methodological concerns with this systematic review [13]. There was no a-priori  
243 protocol, and the study lacked a pilot to test the methods. A librarian's involvement in  
244 verifying the search strategy was not reported, grey literature was not searched, and  
245 duplicate processes were absent for the study selection and data extraction stages.

246 There are several barriers to conducting a systematic review of VSPs across healthcare.  
247 Firstly, there is insufficient research across midwifery and allied health [34,49]. Another  
248 consideration is that all student evaluations in this scoping review were custom designed by  
249 the authors. Therefore, the inconsistency of outcome measures might prevent meaningful  
250 comparison across the papers. One study used previously researched scales for clinical  
251 thinking ability, academic self-efficacy, and student engagement, which demonstrated good  
252 reliability [41]. Some of the exams were standardised [30, 32, 45, 51], but none compared  
253 the baseline marks of each group to determine whether there were differences at the outset.  
254 In all cases, VSP exam scores were compared with a previous cohort that attended  
255 placement FTF pre-pandemic, or the national average, rather than adopting a prospective  
256 design. It is clear from the paucity of research outside nursing and medicine, the lack of  
257 prospective research designs and inconsistent, non-validated outcome measures, that  
258 research into VSPs is in its infancy.

### 259 VSP design and Stakeholder involvement

260 Elements of thoughtful VSP design are evident across several papers. Frameworks such as  
261 ADDIE (analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation), ensure that there is  
262 structure to the process, and stakeholder needs are met [30]. Existing curricula [54-55], or  
263 processes such as Kern's 6-step model for curricular development could be used [43, 45,  
264 46, 50, 52]. If framed within existing standards [40, 49], VSPs can align with specified  
265 learning outcomes. Principles in pedagogy such as andragogy [29, 30] and online learning  
266 [33, 50], ensure that VSPs build features that engage students with experiential learning  
267 [30], promote problem solving [29-30, 39] and active reflection [49]. The conceptual  
268 underpinnings documented across this body of literature could provide a blueprint for best  
269 practice in VSP design.

270 Stakeholder involvement is a key process to inform the design of a VSP. Service users could  
271 inform the content and students are the end users of a VSP, yet no service user involvement  
272 was documented, and students were involved in a minority of studies. When they were  
273 involved, student surveys informed a needs assessment, or they were consulted early in the  
274 process. This is a tokenistic approach compared with co-creation, the preferred method of  
275 engaging with stakeholders. Co-creation involves a collective effort with all stakeholders to  
276 collaborate across the entire design, development, implementation, and testing phases [57].  
277 A UK university provided an overview of VSP development within a nursing programme,  
278 which included students, service users and other universities throughout [58]. Their working  
279 group comprised of academics, clinicians, a service user and carer involvement lead and an  
280 education technology lead. Therefore, in addition to underpinning VSP design with the

281 relevant conceptual frameworks (pedagogical principles, theoretical frameworks, and  
282 published standards), broad stakeholder co-creation is optimal.

### 283 Interprofessional Education (IPE)

284 VSPs have the potential to break down silos between professions, by delivering IPE over a  
285 virtual platform. IPE is defined as two or more professions, 'learning with from and about one  
286 another to improve collaborative practice and quality of care' [59], p4. The intended outcome  
287 is to improve mutual understanding, teamwork, and leadership among different professionals  
288 [60]. VSPs have advantages over FTF training in building asynchronous activities for  
289 flexibility in timetabling and hosting synchronous activities without geographical constraints  
290 [61]. Given the relevance of IPE to quality care and the fit with virtual technologies, IPE-  
291 VSPs may be an important area for future research.

### 292 Content and Technologies

293 Disciplines that rely on image-based diagnoses are more easily adapted to screen-based  
294 delivery, and consistent with this, diagnostic radiology, and pathology VSPs together  
295 constitute over 20% of the medical papers in this review. In the development of this scoping  
296 review, the researchers anticipated that psychology might be suited to VSPs due to the  
297 nature of talking-based therapies over physical skills, although it is possible that  
298 psychological presentations were considered too complex to portray accurately in computer-  
299 generated simulations. With future developments in conversational AI and the growing  
300 acceptance of this technology, this situation may change. Similarly, professions that rely  
301 heavily on hands-on assessment, such as physiotherapy, may feature more in virtual reality  
302 spaces when improvements in haptic technology emerge. In the meantime, virtual  
303 placements that require complex conversation are likely to include telecast or telemedicine  
304 simulations. Likewise, virtual placements that teach advanced handling skills might adopt a  
305 hybrid or blended approach. Selecting studies that conducted a computer-generated  
306 placement entirely online, rather than employing a hybrid or blended approach may explain  
307 why all papers in this review were pandemic responses. COVID-19 necessitated a rapid shift  
308 to provide VSPs as a replacement for lost clinical hours [62]. However, these VSPs were  
309 often produced in a short timeframe, under emergency situations, and may explain why few  
310 papers featured robust experimental designs and conceptual frameworks. Further, hybrid or  
311 blended approaches could combine the strengths of both virtual simulation and FTF  
312 approaches.

313 Replacing FTF placement hours with simulation is a contentious issue. Accordingly, a Delphi  
314 study considered the benefits and limitations of this approach [63]. Expert consensus across  
315 multiple professions agreed that between 11 and 30% of hours replaced would be  
316 acceptable, and this aligns with the current allocation set by the Nursing and Midwifery  
317 Medical Council [64]. VSPs in the curriculum may offset some pressure on workplace  
318 settings as they attempt to fulfil the NHS long-term plan [11]. However, this does not negate  
319 the need to continue building workplace placement capacity [63]. VSPs can be considered  
320 an additional pedagogy that offers a different, yet complimentary experience to traditional  
321 FTF placements.

### 322 Strengths and Weaknesses

323 The strengths of this study relate to the methodology. A structured process for defining  
324 search terms was undertaken, and a librarian was consulted for the search strategy. A range  
325 of databases were searched across medical and technology specialities. Grey literature  
326 sources were searched, and an updated search included trial registries. An a-priori protocol  
327 was registered, and a subset of data was piloted to determine the declared changes.

328 Duplicate processes in study selection and data charting were employed, and existing  
329 guidelines were used to design the protocol, synthesise the findings and report the paper.

330 The weaknesses relate to limiting the search to English language. This increases the risk of  
331 language bias, and a search unrestricted by language may have yielded a more balanced  
332 global representation. Whilst the limited number of publications from developing countries  
333 could be a function of the language limitation, it is also likely that countries with greater  
334 resources were better positioned to make the rapid shift to online education and publish their  
335 research during a global health emergency. Virtual platforms are suited to sharing resources  
336 and overcoming geographical constraints to access expertise, and VSPs present an  
337 opportunity to address inequality in healthcare education moving forward.

338

## 339 **Conclusion**

340 The emerging trends for VSPs in this review demonstrate some positive outcomes, although  
341 a systematic review would be required to quality assess and evaluate the evidence across  
342 healthcare education. For this to be possible, VSP research from allied health and midwifery,  
343 require greater representation. Specific outcome measures for this new mode of learning  
344 also need to be developed and tested, thus ensuring that valid, reliable, and consistent  
345 measures are used across future studies. Future research should include prospective  
346 designs with repeated measures and control/comparator groups to strengthen the evidence.  
347 This review highlights the need for VSP design to be co-created with a wider range of  
348 stakeholders and underpinned by pedagogical principles, theoretical frameworks, and  
349 published standards. Research into student engagement using VR headsets, haptics, and  
350 conversational AI in VSPs, is another area for future research as technologies develop. The  
351 pandemic has revealed an opportunity to augment placement capacity through VSPs. There  
352 is the potential for future VSPs to feature IPE, thus promoting joined-up care in healthcare  
353 graduates. There is also the opportunity for VSPs to improve local and global access to  
354 quality clinical education experiences.

355

## 356 **Acknowledgements**

357 We acknowledge our health librarian, Carlo Avillo, for assisting with the search strategy.  
358 This review will contribute towards a PhD award for J.S.

## 359 **Funding**

360 None

361

## 362 **Conflicts of interest**

363 None

364

## 365 **Appendices (in the Supplemental Material)**

366 Appendix 1: PRISMA-ScR Checklist

367

368 Appendix 2: MEDLINE Search strategy

369

370 Appendix 3: Screening Decisions

371



372 Appendix 4: Revised data charting tool  
373  
374 Appendix 5: Table of included study characteristics  
375  
376 Appendix 6: Papers by Professions  
377  
378 Appendix 7: Conceptual Frameworks  
379  
380 Appendix 8: Bespoke healthcare technology  
381  
382

## 383 References

- 384 1. General Medical Council. Promoting excellence: standards for medical education and  
385 training [online]. 2015. [www.gmc-uk.org/education/standards.asp](http://www.gmc-uk.org/education/standards.asp) (accessed 7<sup>th</sup> February  
386 2022).
- 387 2. Health and Care Professions Council. Your duties as an education provider [online]. 2017.  
388 [www.hcpc-uk.org](http://www.hcpc-uk.org) (accessed 7<sup>th</sup> April 2022).
- 389 3. Nursing and Midwifery Council. Part 2: Standards for student supervision and assessment  
390 Part 1: Standards framework for nursing and midwifery education Part 2: Standards for  
391 student supervision and assessment Part 3: Programme standards [online]. 2018.  
392 [www.nmc.org.ukStandardsforstudentsupervisionandassessment1](http://www.nmc.org.ukStandardsforstudentsupervisionandassessment1) (accessed 7<sup>th</sup> April 2022).
- 393 4. Burgess A, Mellis C. Feedback and assessment for clinical placements: achieving the  
394 right balance. *Adv Med Educ Pract* 2015;19:373-81.
- 395 5. Leighton K, Kardong-Edgren S, Gilbert G. (2021). Are Traditional and Simulated Clinical  
396 Environments Meeting Nursing Students' Learning Needs? *Clinical Simulation in Nursing*  
397 2021;59:85–93.
- 398 6. Society for simulation in Healthcare. About Simulation [online]. 2022. [www.ssih.org/About-SSH/About-Simulation](http://www.ssih.org/About-SSH/About-Simulation) (accessed 1<sup>st</sup> June 2022).
- 400 7. Gaba D. The future vision of simulation in health care. *Quality and Safety in Health Care*  
401 2004;13(1): 2–10.
- 402 8. Health Education England. Harnessing digital technologies for workforce development,  
403 education and training: an overview [online]. 2022. [www.hee.nhs.uk/our-work/innovation-digital-transformation/harnessing-digital-technologies-workforce-development-education-training-overview](http://www.hee.nhs.uk/our-work/innovation-digital-transformation/harnessing-digital-technologies-workforce-development-education-training-overview) (accessed 5<sup>th</sup> December 2022).
- 406 9. Health Education England. Preparing the healthcare workforce to deliver the digital future  
407 The Topol Review: An independent report on behalf of the Secretary of State for Health and  
408 Social Care [online]. 2019. <https://topol.hee.nhs.uk/the-topol-review/> (accessed 17<sup>th</sup> October  
409 2022).
- 410 10. Anderson M, O'Neill C, Macleod Clark J, et al. Street, A., Securing a sustainable and fit-  
411 for-purpose UK health and care workforce. *The Lancet* 2021;397(10288):1992–2011.
- 412 11. National Health Service. Long Term Workforce Plan [online]. 2023.  
413 [www.england.nhs.uk/publication/nhs-long-term-workforce-plan/](http://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/nhs-long-term-workforce-plan/) (accessed 4<sup>th</sup> July 2023).

- 414 12. St John-Matthews J, Hobbs C. Helping to ensure an essential supply of Allied Health  
415 Professions (AHP) Practice Placements: challenges and solutions [online]. 2020.  
416 [www.hee.nhs.uk/our-work/allied-health-professions/increase-capacity/practice-placements-](http://www.hee.nhs.uk/our-work/allied-health-professions/increase-capacity/practice-placements-challenges-solutions)  
417 [challenges-solutions](http://www.hee.nhs.uk/our-work/allied-health-professions/increase-capacity/practice-placements-challenges-solutions) (accessed 4th April 2022).
- 418 13. Hao X, Peng X, Ding X, et al. Application of digital education in undergraduate nursing  
419 and medical interns during the COVID-19 pandemic: A systematic review. *Nurse Educ*  
420 *Today* 2022;108:105183. doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2021.105183.
- 421 14. Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework.  
422 *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 2005;8(1):19–32.
- 423 15. Munn Z, Peters M, Stern C, et al. Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for  
424 authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Medical*  
425 *Research Methodology* 2018;18(1):143. doi: 10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x.
- 426 16. Peters M, Godfrey C, Mclnerney P, et al. Chapter 11: Scoping Reviews. *JBI Manual for*  
427 *Evidence Synthesis* [online]. 2020. <https://doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-20-12> (accessed 1st  
428 June 2022).
- 429 17. Samson J, Gilbey M, Taylor N, et al. Virtual Simulated Placements in Healthcare  
430 Education: A scoping review protocol [online]. [osf.io/ay5gh](https://osf.io/ay5gh) DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/AY5GH
- 431 18. Tricco A, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR):  
432 Checklist and explanation. In *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2018;169(7):467–473.
- 433 19. Cooke A, Smith D, Booth A. Beyond PICO: The SPIDER tool for qualitative evidence  
434 synthesis. *Qualitative Health Research* 2012;22(10):1435–1443.
- 435 20. Health & Care Professions Council. Professions and protected titles [online]. 2018.  
436 [www.hcpc-uk.org/about-us/who-we-regulate/the-professions/](http://www.hcpc-uk.org/about-us/who-we-regulate/the-professions/) (accessed 1<sup>st</sup> September  
437 2022).
- 438 21. National Health Service (NHS) England and Improvement. The 14 allied health  
439 professions [online]. nd. <https://www.england.nhs.uk/ahp/role/> [Accessed 1<sup>st</sup> June 2022].
- 440 22. Clarivate. EndNote (EndNote X9) [online]. 2013. [www.endnote.com](http://www.endnote.com)
- 441 23. McKeown S, Mir Z. Considerations for conducting systematic reviews: evaluating the  
442 performance of different methods for de-duplicating references. *Systematic Reviews* 2021;  
443 10(1):38. doi: 10.1186/s13643-021-01583-y.
- 444 24. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, et al. (2016). Rayyan-a web and mobile app for  
445 systematic reviews. *Systematic Reviews* 2016;5:210. doi.org/10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4.
- 446 25. Hunter K, Webster A, Page M, et al. Searching clinical trials registers: guide for  
447 systematic reviewers. *British Medical Journal* 2022; 26(377): e068791. doi: 10.1136/bmj-  
448 2021-068791.
- 449 26. Bradbury-Jones C, Aveyard H, Herber O, et al. Scoping reviews: the PAGER framework  
450 for improving the quality of reporting. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*  
451 2021;25(4):457-470.

- 452 27. Page M, McKenzie J, Bossuyt P, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated  
453 guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *British Medical Journal* 2021; 372:n71. doi:  
454 10.1136/bmj.n71.
- 455 28. Alpert J, Young M, Lala S, et al. Medical student engagement and educational value of a  
456 remote clinical radiology learning environment: creation of virtual read-out sessions in  
457 response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Academic Radiology* 2021; 28:112-118.
- 458 29. Bhashyam A, Dyer, G. "Virtual" boot camp: Orthopaedic intern education in the time of  
459 COVID-19 and beyond. *Journal of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons* 2020;  
460 28(17), e735-e743. doi: 10.5435/JAAOS-D-20-00559.
- 461 30. Creagh S, Pigg N, Gordillo C, et al. Virtual medical student radiology clerkships during  
462 the COVID-19 pandemic: Distancing is not a barrier. *Clinical Imaging* 2021; 80: 420-423.
- 463 31. De Ponti R, Marazzato J, Maresca A, et al. Pre-graduation medical training including  
464 virtual reality during COVID-19 pandemic: A report on students' perception. *BMC Medical  
465 Education* 2020;20:332-339.
- 466 32. Durfee S, Goldenson R, Gill R, et al. Medical student education roadblock due to  
467 COVID-19: Virtual radiology core clerkship to the rescue. *Academic Radiology* 2020.  
468 27(10),1461-1466.
- 469 33. FehI M, Gehres V, Geier A, et al. Medical students' adoption and evaluation of a  
470 completely digital general practice clerkship - cross-sectional survey and cohort comparison  
471 with face-to-face teaching. *Medical Education Online* 2022;27(1): 2028334. doi:  
472 10.1080/10872981.2022.2028334.
- 473 34. Ganji J, Shirvani M, Motahari-Tabari N, et al. & Tayebi, T. (2022). Design,  
474 implementation and evaluation of a virtual clinical training protocol for midwifery internship in  
475 a gynecology course during COVID-19 pandemic: A semi-experimental study. *Nurse  
476 Education Today* 2022;111:105293. doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2022.105293.
- 477 35. Gomez E, Azadi J, Magid D. Innovation born in isolation: Rapid transformation of an in-  
478 person medical student radiology elective to a remote learning experience during the  
479 COVID-19 pandemic. *Academic Radiology* 2020; 27(9):1285-1290.
- 480 36. He M, Tang X, Zhang H, et al. Remote clinical training practice in the neurology  
481 internship during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Medical Education Online* 2021;26:1899642. doi:  
482 10.1080/10872981.2021.1899642.
- 483 37. Holmberg M, Dela Cruz E, Longino A, et al. Development of a single-institution virtual  
484 internal medicine subinternship with near-peer teaching in response to the COVID-19  
485 pandemic. *Academic Medicine* 2021;96(12):1706-1710.
- 486 38. Joung J, Kang K. Can Virtual Simulation Replace Clinical Practical Training for  
487 Psychiatric Nursing? *Issues Ment Health Nursing* 2022;43(8):706-711.
- 488 39. Kasai H, Shikino K, Saito G, et al. Alternative approaches for clinical clerkship during the  
489 COVID-19 pandemic: online simulated clinical practice for inpatients and outpatients-A  
490 mixed method. *BMC Medical Education* 2021;21(1):149. doi: 10.1186/s12909-021-02586-y.

- 491 40. Kubin L, Fogg N, Trinka M. Transitioning child health clinical content from direct care to  
492 online instruction. *The Journal of Nursing Education* 2021;60(3):177-179.
- 493 41. Luo Y, Geng C, Pei X, et al. The evaluation of the distance learning combining webinars  
494 and virtual simulations for senior nursing students during the COVID-19 Period. *Clinical*  
495 *Simulation in Nursing* 2021;57:31-40.
- 496 42. Martin-Delgado L, Goni-Fuste B, Monforte-Royo C, et al. A teaching role practicum  
497 during the COVID-19 for final year nursing students in Spain: A qualitative study. *Journal of*  
498 *Professional Nursing* 2022;42:51-57.
- 499 43. Nguyen W, Fromer I, Remskar M, et al. Development and Implementation of Video-  
500 Recorded Simulation Scenarios to Facilitate Case-Based Learning Discussions for Medical  
501 Students' Virtual Anesthesiology Clerkship. *MedEdPORTAL* 2023;4(19):e11306. doi:  
502 10.15766/mep\_2374-8265.11306.
- 503 44. Rahm A, Tollner M, Hubert M, et al. Effects of realistic e-learning cases on students'  
504 learning motivation during COVID-19. *PloS one* 2021;16(4):e0249425. doi:  
505 10.1371/journal.pone.0249425.
- 506 45. Redinger K, Greene J. Virtual emergency medicine clerkship curriculum during the  
507 COVID-19 pandemic: Development, application, and outcomes. *Western Journal of*  
508 *Emergency Medicine: Integrating Emergency Care with Population Health* 2021;22(3):792-  
509 798.
- 510 46. Samuelli B, Srer N, Jotkowitz A, et al. Remote pathology education during the COVID-  
511 19 era: Crisis converted to opportunity. *Annals of Diagnostic Pathology* 2020;49:151612. doi:  
512 10.1016/j.anndiagpath.2020.151612.
- 513 47. Smith J, Jones P. The COVID-19 e-lective: using innovation to manage disrupted  
514 medical student clinical placements. *BMC Medical Education* 2023;623(1):92. doi:  
515 10.1186/s12909-023-04067-w.
- 516 48. Steehler A, Pettitt-Schieber B, Studer M, et al. Implementation and evaluation of a virtual  
517 elective in otolaryngology in the time of COVID-19. *Otolaryngology Head Neck Surgery*  
518 *Journal* 2020;164(3):556–561.
- 519 49. Taylor N, Wyres M, Green A, et al. Developing and piloting a simulated placement  
520 experience for students. *British Journal of Nursing* 2021;30(13), S19–S24. doi:  
521 10.12968/bjon.2021.30.13.S19.
- 522 50. Villa S, Janeway H, Preston-Suni K, et al. An Emergency medicine virtual clerkship:  
523 Made for COVID, here to stay. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine* 2021;23(1):33-39.
- 524 51. Weston J, Zauche L. Comparison of virtual simulation to clinical practice for prelicensure  
525 nursing students in pediatrics. *Nurse Educator* 2021;46(5), E95-E98. doi:  
526 10.1097/NNE.0000000000000946.
- 527 52. White M, Birkness J, Salimian K, et al. Continuing undergraduate pathology medical  
528 education in the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) global pandemic: The Johns Hopkins  
529 virtual surgical pathology clinical elective. *Archives of Pathology of Laboratory Medicine*  
530 2021;145(7):814-820.

- 531 53. Wik V, Barfield S, Cornwall M, et al. Finding the right balance: Student perceptions of  
532 using virtual simulation as a community placement. *International Journal of Nursing*  
533 *Education Scholarship* 2022;19(1). doi: 10.1515/ijnes-2021-0135.
- 534 54. Williams C, Familusi O, Ziemba J, et al. Adapting to the educational challenges of a  
535 pandemic: development of a novel virtual urology subinternship during the time of COVID-  
536 19. *Urology* 2021;148:70–76.
- 537 55. Zhou T, Huang S, Cheng J, et al. The distance teaching practice of combined mode of  
538 massive open online course micro-video for interns in emergency department during the  
539 COVID-19 epidemic period. *Telemedicine Journal of e-Health* 2020;26, 584–588.
- 540 56. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Guidance: Countries defined  
541 as developing by the OECD [online]. [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/countries-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/countries-defined-as-developing-by-the-oecd)  
542 [defined-as-developing-by-the-oecd](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/countries-defined-as-developing-by-the-oecd) (accessed 15<sup>th</sup> November 2022).
- 543 57. Sanders E, Sappers P. *Convivial Toolbox: Generative Research at the front end of*  
544 *design*. Amsterdam: BIS 2008.
- 545 58. Sanderson L, Choma L, Cappelli T, et al. Arrey, S., Noonan, I., Prescott, S., Essen, C.,  
546 McCrorie, C., Bland, A. (2023). Developing online simulated practice placements: a case  
547 study. *British Journal of Nursing* 2023;32(13):636-643.
- 548 59. Barr H, Ford J, Gray R, et al. Helme, M., Hutchings, M., Low, H., Machin, A., & Reeves,  
549 S. (2017). *Interprofessional education guidelines* [online].  
550 [www.caipe.org/resources/publications/caipe-publications/caipe-2017-interprofessional-](http://www.caipe.org/resources/publications/caipe-publications/caipe-2017-interprofessional-education-guidelines-barr-h-ford-j-gray-r-helme-m-hutchings-m-low-h-machin-reeves-s)  
551 [education-guidelines-barr-h-ford-j-gray-r-helme-m-hutchings-m-low-h-machin-reeves-s](http://www.caipe.org/resources/publications/caipe-publications/caipe-2017-interprofessional-education-guidelines-barr-h-ford-j-gray-r-helme-m-hutchings-m-low-h-machin-reeves-s)  
552 (accessed 10th August 2022).
- 553 60. Centre for the Advancement of Interprofessional Education. *CAIPE Strategy 2022-2027*  
554 [online]. [www.caipe.org/strategy#1](http://www.caipe.org/strategy#1) (accessed 15<sup>th</sup> November 2022).
- 555 61. Fealy S, Jones D, Hutton A, et al. The integration of immersive virtual reality in tertiary  
556 nursing and midwifery education: A scoping review. *Nurse Education Today* 2019;79:14–19.
- 557 62. Goh P, Sandars J. (2020). A vision of the use of technology in medical education after  
558 the COVID-19 pandemic [version 1] *MedEdPublish* 2020; 9(49).  
559 doi.org/10.15694/mep.2020.000049.1
- 560 63. Bridge P, Adeoye J, Edge C, et al. Simulated placements as partial replacement of  
561 clinical training time: a Delphi consensus study. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing* 2022;68 42-  
562 48.
- 563 64. Nursing and Midwifery Council. *Recovery standards* [online]. 2022.  
564 [www.nmc.org.uk/globalassets/sitedocuments/education-standards/current-recovery-](http://www.nmc.org.uk/globalassets/sitedocuments/education-standards/current-recovery-programme-standards.pdf)  
565 [programme-standards.pdf](http://www.nmc.org.uk/globalassets/sitedocuments/education-standards/current-recovery-programme-standards.pdf) (accessed 17<sup>th</sup> October 2022).




Figure 1: PRISMA chart. Modified from [27]




Figure 1: PRISMA chart. Modified from [27]



