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Abstract

Background
Education delivery in higher education institutions was severely affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, with emergency remote teaching developed and adapted promptly for the circumstances. This rapid review investigated the effectiveness of alternative education delivery strategies during the pandemic for medical, dental, nursing and pharmacy students, to help plan and adapt further education provision.

Methods
We included 23 primary studies in undergraduate education, all published in 2020-2021, no relevant UK-based or postgraduate studies were found. Included studies comprised 10 single cohort descriptive; 11 comparative descriptive; and two RCTs. There was considerable variability in terms of students, type of distance learning, platforms used and outcome measures.

Results
In medicine (n=14), self-reported competency and confidence, and demonstrable suturing skills were achieved through participating in remote learning. However, lower levels of knowledge were obtained by students who received virtual or blended learning compared to in-person teaching (low-very low confidence). Using bespoke interactive platforms in undergraduate medical training was superior to standard video (low confidence) or ‘textbook’ presentations (very low confidence).

In dentistry (n=2), remote learning led to knowledge gained (low confidence), but self-reported practical and interpersonal skills were lower with remote rather than in-person learning (very low confidence).

In nursing (n=3), remote learning, when compared to in-person, resulted in similar knowledge and self-reported competency levels (very low confidence) pre-COVID, but confidence was higher when learning or assessment was conducted virtually (low confidence).
In pharmacy (n=4), virtual learning was associated with higher skills, but lower knowledge compared to in-person, pre-COVID; self-reported competency and confidence scores were similar between the two groups (very low confidence).

Conclusions
Remote teaching was valued, and learning was achieved, but the comparative effectiveness of virtual versus in-person teaching is less clear. Supplementary alternative or in-person practical sessions may be required post-emergency to address learning needs for some disadvantaged student groups.
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Introduction

Education delivery in higher education institutions was severely affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, especially for healthcare students whose continuing education is imperative to maintain a well-educated healthcare workforce. Many courses transitioned to a period of remote emergency teaching, developed and adapted promptly for the circumstances, largely without prior contingency planning. For example, the American Society of Plastic Surgeons announced free access to its online Education Network for all medical students with an interest in plastic surgery, whilst Ahmed et al. suggested a range of online tools and resources that could be employed for online rheumatology education. In Jordan, distance e-learning was promptly engaged to maintain the continuity of medical education, and in Pakistan dental educators came up with innovative solutions to resume dental education remotely. Bakshi et al. argued that whilst the COVID-19 outbreak disrupted the educational experiences of medical students worldwide, this was particularly significant in areas such as ophthalmology where structured education and clinical exposure had already declined. A shift to virtual education for nursing students in Iran highlighted some of the challenges faced by educators and students, such as lack of infrastructure, reduced readiness of educators and students for e-learning, and the time to prepare educational content, whilst educators in Canada emphasised the importance of continuing to engage nursing students online.

Reviews have also highlighted the challenges in migrating to remote education which include poor knowledge of staff on how to deal with technology, poor internet connections and difficulty in transitioning content for online learning. By contrast, some students and staff report satisfaction with remote learning, especially when collaboration and engagement with peers is facilitated.

A preliminary search of repositories specific to COVID-19 literature identified several existing reviews of alternative education delivery strategies for medical and healthcare students during the COVID-19 pandemic. The systematic review by Wilcha et al. looked at the effectiveness of virtual teaching for medical education and suggested that it was effective. However, searching was limited to two databases, including Google Scholar, and the review appears to have been conducted by one author with no critical appraisal conducted. Another systematic review by He et al. explored the use of synchronous distance education.
(videoconference or web conference, online classroom or virtual classroom) compared with traditional education for medical, dental, nurse, pharmacy students and other health science–related students. It found that there were no significant differences in terms of knowledge or skills but that satisfaction was rated higher for distance education. For nursing students, a scoping review by Jowsey et al. suggested that when delivered purposefully, blended learning (a mix of face-to-face and online study) can positively influence and impact on the achievements of students, especially when used to support distance education. However, none of the existing reviews specifically explored effectiveness of alternative education delivery strategies for medical, nursing, dental and pharmacy students, or allied health professionals during the COVID-19 pandemic, or provided a separate summary of the evidence for these disciplines. An initial scope of the evidence base for these healthcare disciplines identified a significant volume of primary research in the area for medical, nursing, dental and pharmacy students but very little for other healthcare disciplines including allied health professionals. We therefore conducted a rapid review of the effectiveness of alternative education delivery strategies that have been put into place for undergraduate and postgraduate medical, nursing, dental, and pharmacy students.

**Methods**

This rapid review was registered with the International prospective register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO) following the completion of the database searches, and study selection (Registration number: CRD42022304295).

**Eligibility criteria**

The inclusion criteria were informed by the PICO (Participants, Intervention, Comparison, Outcomes) framework (see Table 1).

**Search strategy**

Searches were conducted across four databases: On the OVID platform: MEDLINE and Embase, on the EBSCO platform: CINAHL and ERIC, from December 2019 to 8th June 2021 for English language citations. An initial search of MEDLINE was undertaken (medicine or medical or nurs* or dental or dentistry or pharmacy or pharmacist) AND education* or train* or teach* or student* or undergraduate* or postgraduate* AND COVID* or coronavirus) followed by analysis of the text words.
contained in the title and abstract, and of the index terms used to describe the article. This informed the development of search strategies tailored for each information source (additional material one). The reference list of all included studies was screened for additional studies.

**Study selection process**
All citations retrieved from the database searches were imported into EndNote™ and duplicates and irrelevant citations removed and then imported to Covidence™ for study selection. Two reviewers dual screened at least 20% of citations using the information provided in the title and abstract using the software package Covidence™, resolving all conflicts. The remaining citations were then screened by a single reviewer, screening with categories of ‘include’ and ‘exclude’. To streamline the review process, the project team decided against a third category of ‘unsure’ and instead, where there was uncertainty about a citation, it was categorised as ‘include’ and the decision was made based on the full text. The full texts were screened for inclusion by one reviewer using a purposefully designed form which was piloted using approximately 10 manuscripts. One reviewer then screened full text manuscripts, and another reviewer checked all excluded manuscripts.

**Data extraction**
All demographic data were extracted directly into tables by one reviewer and checked by another. The data included specific details about the interventions, populations, study methods and outcomes of significance to the review question and specific objectives. A template for the data extraction process was piloted on manuscripts for each of the included study designs before use. All outcome data were extracted directly into tables by one reviewer and checked by another.

**Quality appraisal**
The methodological quality of all the research studies was assessed by one reviewer, and judgements verified by a second reviewer, using JBI design-specific critical appraisal tools (https://jbi.global/critical-appraisal-tools). When a study met a criterion for inclusion a score of one was given. Where a particular point for inclusion was regarded as “unclear” it was given a score of zero. Where a particular point for inclusion was regarded as “not applicable” this point was deducted from the total score. All included studies were assessed using this method and their overall critical
appraisal scores were calculated and are displayed for each study in Tables 2 and 3. For the full details of the critical appraisal scores see additional material two.

Synthesis
The data were reported narratively as a series of thematic summaries and presented separately for each health care discipline. Two RCTs were included in the review but there was insufficient homogeneity across the studies and therefore we were unable to perform a meta-analysis.

Assessment of body of evidence
The confidence in the synthesised findings was assessed by one reviewer and judgements verified by a second reviewer. The RCTs were assessed using the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach. Due to heterogeneity of the different interventions within similar settings, outcome data were only available for results from single studies and guidance was followed on undertaking GRADE for data of this type. Quantitative descriptive studies were assessed by applying the principles of GRADE. For further details of this processes see additional material three and four. Most findings in this rapid review were of low or very low quality and ratings are displayed for each study in Tables 2 and 3. This was mainly due to imprecision because of small sample sizes, and/or confidence intervals not being reported, and/or limitations because baseline levels of the outcome of interest not being controlled for, and/or lack of clarity of confounding factors.

Results
Of the 10,978 citations retrieved from our searches, 21 descriptive studies and two RCTs met our eligibility criteria. For details of the excluded studies see additional material five. The included studies focused on undergraduate medical students (n=14), undergraduate dental students (n=2), undergraduate nursing students (n=3) and undergraduate pharmacy students (n=4). We did not find any studies that focused on postgraduate students, and research, that focused on clinically based postgraduate training, such as internships, were excluded. The flow of citations through each stage of the review process is displayed in a PRISMA flowchart, see Figure 1.
Figure 1: PRISMA flow diagram
Overview of evidence base for medical students

Six pre-test / post-test designs\textsuperscript{20–25} and six post-test only descriptive studies\textsuperscript{26–30} and two RCTs\textsuperscript{31,32} provided evidence of the effectiveness of alternative education delivery strategies for undergraduate medical students during the COVID-19 pandemic (see Table 4). Most studies (\(n=7\)) were conducted in the USA\textsuperscript{21–25,29,33}. The remaining studies were conducted in Germany\textsuperscript{26,27,31}, Japan\textsuperscript{20}, South Korea\textsuperscript{28}, Switzerland\textsuperscript{32} and Greece\textsuperscript{30}.

These covered a wide range of both university and clinical based modules/ courses and included neurosurgery\textsuperscript{21}, surgical instruments, knot tying and suturing\textsuperscript{24}, digital histology\textsuperscript{26}, a residency preparation course\textsuperscript{22}, simulated patient consultations, documentation, and case presentation\textsuperscript{27}, simulated clinical experience in respiratory unit and general medicine\textsuperscript{20}, generic medical education\textsuperscript{28}, neuroanatomy\textsuperscript{29}, emergency medicine\textsuperscript{25,33}, musculoskeletal system anatomy and neuroanatomy\textsuperscript{30}, the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale\textsuperscript{32}, operative techniques and skills\textsuperscript{31} and informed consent for surgical procedures\textsuperscript{23}.

A variety of different online platforms was used to deliver synchronous learning; five used the Zoom video conferencing platform\textsuperscript{20,21,24,26,27} three used the University Supported Management Systems: CANVAS\textsuperscript{22,29} or Meducator\textsuperscript{30}, one used Microsoft teams\textsuperscript{33}, another Skype for business\textsuperscript{30}, and three did not specify the type of video communication software used\textsuperscript{23,25,28}. Other methods included neuroanatomical interactive virtual activities using “Digital Neuroanatomy” software\textsuperscript{29}, simulated patient encounters employing online MedEd Case X videos\textsuperscript{33} and structural specimens replaced by photographs\textsuperscript{30}. Five studies also incorporated asynchronous elements using pre-recorded lectures\textsuperscript{23,28,30} or readily available podcasts\textsuperscript{25,33}. For one further study the course content (8 topics) was organised by 12 rising\textsuperscript{1} fourth-year medical students under supervision\textsuperscript{25}. The two RCTs used bespoke interactive online platforms\textsuperscript{31,32} and compared the outcomes to those students learning the same topic via a standard video format\textsuperscript{31} or textbook based preparation\textsuperscript{32}.

\textsuperscript{1} In the summer of an academic year, there are two “senior” classes (these are fourth year college students in America). The class that just graduated, known as graduating seniors, and the one that will be seniors, when fall comes around known as "oncoming senior" or "rising seniors."
Studies were conducted with students in their final year (Clerkship / Interns) (n=7), first year (n=2), second and third years (n=1), third year only (n=1), across all years (n=1), and a further two did not specify the year of study. Outcomes explored were confidence (n=5), competency (n=2) and knowledge (n=6).

Levels of competency, confidence and knot tying and suturing skills were found to have improved across the course of learning and a further study suggested that levels of competency were the same when learning was conducted virtually (2020) compared to in-person pre-COVID (2019). Evidence from RCTs showed that knowledge was greater when learning was conducted using bespoke interactive platforms with a standard video format reported during the COVID pandemic. Evidence from descriptive studies showed mixed results for knowledge, assessed and compared between cohorts at the end of virtual learning (2020) and in-person learning (2019). Four studies reported lower levels of knowledge for students in the virtual cohort and one further study found no difference.

Overview of the evidence base for dental students

Two post-test descriptive studies (see Table 5) conducted in Poland and Germany provided evidence of the effectiveness of alternative education delivery strategies for undergraduate dental students studying specific modules or courses in conservative dentistry with endodontics or operative dentistry during the COVID-19 pandemic. In one study, the teaching consisted of asynchronous online screencasts (screen-captured PowerPoint presentations with narrated audio) using Stud-IP (a source learning management system) and discussed via synchronous video meetings using the Zoom video conferencing platform. The other study used a blended learning approach using the Blackboard Collaborate platform. The outcome of interest across both studies was knowledge acquisition. Findings from both studies suggest that these alternative educational methods contributed towards knowledge and skill acquisition assessed through a self-assessment survey completed by fourth year students and through a final summative examination. However, the evidence suggests lower levels of knowledge for the subtopic of
periodontology and lower levels of practical skills for 3rd year dental students when learning was conducted virtually compared to in-person.

**Overview of evidence base for nursing students**

Three descriptive studies (see Table 6) conducted in Spain, Japan and USA provided evidence for the effectiveness of alternative educational delivery strategies for nursing students studying a specific module in human genomics, simulation in paediatric clinical practice and for the delivery of remote OSCEs with COPD patients during the COVID-19 pandemic. All three studies compared a group of students receiving a remotely delivered educational package with a group receiving standard, in-person education. In two studies the comparison groups were students from the previous, pre-COVID academic year, however, Weston and Zauche studied a cohort of students from the same academic year, 2019-2020, where half had received the standard educational package before the alternative version was introduced. Only one study used a pre-test / post-test design and thus compared results within as well as between groups. In this study, the conventional course was transferred to remote synchronous learning (narrative over PowerPoint), also uploading handouts and worksheets with no changes to content. Arrogante et al. used the virtual classroom platform Blackboard Collaborate to conduct OSCEs comprising eight simulated clinical scenarios with standardised patients. Weston and Zauche substituted virtual simulation using the i-Human platform to replace in-person clinical practice and simulation laboratory learning. Outcomes explored were competency (n=2), confidence (n=1) and knowledge (n=2).

The evidence suggests that levels of competency were the same and levels of confidence were higher when learning or assessment was conducted virtually (2020) compared to in-person pre-COVID (2019). Knowledge improves regardless of whether the learning has been conducted virtually (2020) or in-person pre-COVID (2019).

**Overview of the evidence base for pharmacy students**

Four descriptive studies (see Table 7), all conducted in the USA, provided evidence for the effectiveness of alternative education delivery strategies for undergraduate pharmacy students studying specific modules or courses in integrated patient care.
hypertension/drug information, advanced pharmacy experience, delivery of remote Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs) for patient counselling, and taking a medical history during the COVID-19 pandemic. Two studies used a pre-test/post-test design, the remaining two reported a post-test only study design, with a comparison between the study population and an earlier (pre-COVID) cohort of students.

In one study the teaching included remote synchronous learning, three studies used the Zoom videoconferencing platform, two studies used the University platform Blackboard Collaborate and one study also used the University Supported Management System: CANVAS. The outcomes of interest that were explored were competency (n=2), confidence (n=2), knowledge (n=2), skills (n=2)

Evidence suggests competency outcomes improved across the course of learning and were similar when learning was conducted virtually (2020) compared to in-person pre-COVID (2019). Confidence was found to either improve across the course of learning or be the same for virtual (2020) compared to in-person pre-COVID (2019) learning. However, lower levels of knowledge were reported when learning was conducted virtually compared to in-person pre-COVID. The evidence suggests that, overall, students performed similarly between in-person (2019) and online (2020) OSCEs, although for some, skills performance was higher when students undertook these virtually.

**Discussion**

The findings of this rapid review are based on very limited evidence for dental (2 descriptive studies), pharmacy (4 descriptive studies) and nursing (3 descriptive studies) education. Only one finding from across all twelve of the descriptive studies that focused on medical education was rated as being of moderate quality. As expected, levels of knowledge, competency and confidence improved over the course of virtual learning. However, when results were compared to students who had completed in-person learning in the years before the COVID-19 pandemic, results were mixed. Most studies across the disciplines reported similar findings across all outcome variables suggesting that virtual learning produced similar results to in-person learning. To our knowledge this is the first rapid review of the...
effectiveness of alternative education delivery strategies for undergraduate and postgraduate medical, dental, nursing and pharmacy education during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Previous systematic reviews showed online learning outcomes to be comparable to in-person learning. At the time of conducting this rapid review we were unable to locate any reviews that took an interdisciplinary approach. Given the potential overlap and value in sharing practices across the various healthcare educational contexts, we aimed to address this gap.

Evidence from two RCTs showed that knowledge was greater when learning was conducted using bespoke interactive platforms compared with non-interactive formats, reported during the COVID pandemic.\textsuperscript{31,32} These findings concur with research conducted in the field prior to COVID-19, with three systematic reviews suggesting that pre-planned online eLearning for undergraduates in health professions is equivalent, possibly superior to traditional learning.\textsuperscript{43–45}

Data from this rapid review indicated that the transition from traditional teaching into remote methods seemed to affect students' performance at exams, particularly so for the practical based subjects in dentistry and medicine. It is recognised that emergency remote teaching and learning differs from planned online learning.\textsuperscript{46,47} Most remote teaching and learning that initially took place during the COVID-19 pandemic was not planned and was adapted promptly due to the emergency circumstances that presented. In addition, this new learning did not take into account the additional stress that e-learning can cause\textsuperscript{48} or incorporate strategies to increase social presence which Natajaran and Joseph\textsuperscript{49} argue is essential to improve student nurses’ satisfaction with online teaching.

**Implications for policy and practice**

Healthcare educators need to revisit the research base surrounding remote learning and consider this evidence when planning future online education. Whilst lessons learnt were quickly put into place, the COVID-19 pandemic brought issues to the fore that have long been debated in healthcare education: reduced clinical exposure, a move away from mass didactic education, and the need to ensure all healthcare
students are provided with the skills and knowledge required to transition to competent caring health professionals with the ability to think critically and source and apply evidence to practice. With the increasing need for skilled healthcare professionals, policy makers need to consider how educational institutions can be provided with the resources required and how existing educators can be upskilled and supported to develop technology-enhanced learning experiences. Students from school entry age onwards need to be prepared for more online and blended learning experience which should include providing them with strategies they can use to support their emotional and psychological well-being, whilst accessing remote learning. Future research should investigate the effectiveness of blended learning approaches compared to more traditional education, in addition to investigating the views and perceptions of both students and educators and the barriers and facilitators to engaging effectively in blended learning.

**Limitations**

To complete the review rapidly a limited number of databases were searched, and further studies may have been identified if additional bibliographic databases had been used. Out of the 23 included studies none was conducted within the UK and the majority (n=21) were descriptive studies. All included studies focused on undergraduate not postgraduate education. Of these, 11 studies employed a pre-test/post-test design, and the remainder were post-test only evaluations. The two RCTs both used a test or examination to assess knowledge, but these evaluated two different interventions and therefore statistical pooling of data using meta-analysis was not appropriate. Furthermore, both studies had small sample sizes and poor response rates (75/158 and 44/58).

Regarding the limitations of this review’s methods, the tool used for evaluating the confidence of the quantitative descriptive studies is an adaptation of GRADE and has not been approved by the tool’s originators. Finding well conducted comparative research proved challenging as not all educational researchers sign up to this experimental ideology when it comes to investigating teaching. Indeed, most published educational studies are small scale and qualitative in nature. There is, however, an agreement that there is a lack of high-quality studies to serve as models for future development in remote learning and teaching.\(^{50,51}\) We therefore suggest
that studies that do apply the experimental approach should aim to enhance their research rigour in order for them to provide findings that can be synthesised more meaningfully. We also recognise the potential impact of the pandemic on resources and time, all of which would have likely impacted the quality of research. For this reason, we suggest that our rapid review provides a platform for further research that will consider the large body of literature that has emerged from the various fields of healthcare education since we conducted our review.

**Conclusions**
Remote teaching was valued, and learning was achieved, but the comparative effectiveness of virtual versus in-person teaching delivered in a pandemic is less clear. In addition, the available evidence is insufficient to demonstrate equivalence for student speciality groups and it is unclear whether planned remote teaching, rather than relying on emergency adaptation, would be more effective. For some healthcare students, academic achievement appears to decline when practical learning is insufficient, and this is something that must be addressed. However, this could be attributed to the sudden transition to online learning mid semester in which students did not have a chance to prepare or plan how they may need to adjust their own learning strategies. Moreover, teaching online requires a new skill set and educators may have had very little chance to upskill. It is therefore difficult to use the findings to inform future educational planning. Identifying which aspects of health education delivery are best delivered via a particular format or platform will be key to improving the efficiency of learning for organisations and accessibility of material for students. Time will tell as to the career progress of the students whose studies have been affected by COVID-19 with educators and regulators ensuring that health care professionals are supported in their learning and standards are maintained. Further research with robust methods to evaluate alternative education delivery strategies is needed to inform policy decision-making in this area.
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Table 1: Eligibility criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PICO</th>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Undergraduate students, Post-graduate students, Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Pharmacy</td>
<td>All other allied health professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention / exposure</td>
<td>Specific educational delivery (including clinical skills delivery) during COVID-19</td>
<td>Assessment / examination processes, Continuing professional development not leading to a postgraduate qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Education delivery (including clinical skills delivery) prior to COVID-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Educational outcomes of knowledge, skills, confidence, competency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further study considerations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Primary research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>All academic and healthcare institutions that deliver undergraduate or post graduate education with OECD countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Summary of critical appraisal scores from descriptive surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrongante et al 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowart and Uplike 2000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darici et al., 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harendze et al., 2020</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasai et al., 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawasaki et al., 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim et al., 2020</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martini et al., 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday et al., 2020</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel and Black 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijakowski et al., 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips et al., 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qaranto et al., 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redinger and Greene 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenthal et al., 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoular et al., 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singh et al., 2020</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totlis et al., 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston and Zauche 2020</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanzow et al., 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang et al., 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?  
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?  
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?  
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?  
5. Were confounding factors identified?  
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?  
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?  
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?

Table 3: Summary of critical appraisal scores from randomised controlled trials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Q13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suppan et al., 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmitz et al., 2021</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>UC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>UC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Was true randomization used for assignment of participants to treatment groups?  
2. Was allocation to treatment groups concealed?  
3. Were treatment groups similar at the baseline?  
4. Were participants blind to treatment assignment?  
5. Were those delivering treatment blind to treatment assignment?  
6. Were outcomes assessors blind to treatment assignment?  
7. Were treatment groups treated identically other than the intervention of interest?  
8. Was follow up complete and if not, were differences between groups in terms of their follow up adequately described and analysed?  
9. Were participants analysed in the groups to which they were randomized?  
10. Were outcomes measured in the same way for treatment groups?  
11. Were outcomes measured in a reliable way?  
12. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?  
13. Was the trial design appropriate, and any deviations from the standard RCT design (individual randomization, parallel groups) accounted for in the conduct and analysis of the trial?
Table 4: Characteristics of included studies focusing on medical students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/s</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Remote platform</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Outcomes/outcome measures</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Type of analysis</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martini et al., 2021</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Virtual neurosurgery seminar series</td>
<td>Zoom video conferencing platform</td>
<td>June, July 2020</td>
<td>595 medical students (from all school years 1 to 5) across the countries registered with an average of 82 students participating live in each weekly lecture (range, 41-150)</td>
<td>Completing pre and post-test study (n=32)</td>
<td>Confidence with material pertaining to core concepts across various neurosurgical subdisciplines.</td>
<td>Confidence (Mean±SD) Cerebrovascular neurosurgery Pre (5.90±0.34); Post (8.36±0.19), p&lt;0.0001 Malignant brain tumours Pre (4.95±0.45); Post (8.28 ± 0.23), p&lt;0.0001 Head trauma Pre (5.54± 0.34); Post (7.97± 0.27), p&lt;0.0001 Spine trauma Pre (4.96± 0.38); Post (8.19± 0.26), p&lt;0.0001 Neuroendocrinology/pituitary pathology Pre (6.79± 0.31); Post (8.74± 0.19), p&lt;0.0001 Pediatric neurosurgery Pre (5.79± 0.33); Post (8.25±0.26), p&lt;0.0001 Neurocritical care Pre (4.86± 0.44); Post (8.25±0.26), p&lt;0.0001 Minor neurosurgical procedures Pre (4.48± 0.44); Post (7.86± 0.28), p&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday et al., 2020</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Online virtual internship boot camp</td>
<td>Canvas online learning management system</td>
<td>Academic years 2019/2020 Fourth years (n=89)</td>
<td>Self-assessed confidence and knowledge response rates Pre-test (76–87%); Post-test (60-82%)</td>
<td>Post-test assessment Response rate 99%</td>
<td>Confidence – Low Knowledge – Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All students passed post-test assessment 83 (94%) achieved a score of 70% or higher, 4 (4.5%) scored in the 60-70% range, and 1 scored 55%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (Year, Location)</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Type of analysis</th>
<th>Outcome measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qaranto et al., 2021[^4]</td>
<td>Academic year 2019/2020; Final years (n=43)</td>
<td>Descriptive study</td>
<td>Pre-test / Post-test</td>
<td>Self-assessment Likert scale (1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darici et al., 2021[^6]</td>
<td>Academic year 2019/2020; Third years (n=175/201)</td>
<td>Descriptive study</td>
<td>Pre-test / Post-test</td>
<td>Self-assessment Likert scale (1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harendza et al., 2020[^7]</td>
<td>Academic year 2019/2020; Final years (n=103)</td>
<td>Descriptive study</td>
<td>Pre-test / Post-test</td>
<td>Self-assessment Likert scale (1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasai et al., 2021[^8]</td>
<td>Academic Year 2019/2020; Fifth years (Clerkship)(n=43)</td>
<td>Descriptive study</td>
<td>Pre-test / Post-test</td>
<td>Self-assessment Likert scale (1-5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Knowledge**: 53 item competency-based exam

**Study design**: Descriptive study

**Type of analysis**: Pre-test / Post-test

**Outcome measures**: Self-assessment Likert scale (1-5)

[^4]: Virtual training including simulated patient consultations, documentation, and case presentation
[^6]: Online digital histology course
[^7]: Virtual training including simulated patient consultations, documentation, and case presentation
[^8]: Online simulated clinical practice for the respiratory unit and general medicine
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Outcome measures</th>
<th>Type of analysis</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Knowledge (Mean ± SD)</th>
<th>Type of analysis</th>
<th>Outcome measures</th>
<th>Quality appraisal rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim et al., 2020</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Remote teaching for medical undergraduates</td>
<td>Academic years 2017/2018 (n=149 to 152) sitting exams (year of study ns) Academic year 2018/2019 (n=147 to 158) sitting exams (year of study ns) Academic year 2019/2020 (n=143 to 145) sitting exams (year of study ns)</td>
<td>Descriptive study</td>
<td>Anatomical pathology</td>
<td>Comparison across three academic years</td>
<td>Examination scores</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel and Black, 2021</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Remote, blended learning approach for teaching neuroanatomy</td>
<td>Academic year 2019/2020 First years (n=103) and 2020 First years (n=104)</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Anatomy, biochemistry, histology, gastrointestinal system, respiratory system, circulatory system</td>
<td>Mean scores</td>
<td>Examination scores</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redinger and Greene, 2021</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Traditional rotation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kim et al., 2020
South Korea
Remote teaching for medical undergraduates
e-Teaching and Learning System
Pre-recorded video lectures or live-streamed using video communication software
Platforms not specified

Nathaniel and Black, 2021
USA
Remote, blended learning approach for teaching neuroanatomy
Neuroanatomical interactive virtual activities “Digital Neuroanatomy” software
Lectures Recorded on WebEx/Panopto and posted online on the Canvas platform
4 weeks

Redinger and Greene, 2021
USA
Traditional rotation

Study design
Descriptive study
Post-test

Type of analysis
Analytical statistics
Mean scores

Comparison across two academic years

Quality appraisal rating
5 out of 7

Confidence evaluation
Knowledge – Low

Knowledge (Mean ± SD)
Anatomy 2018 (86.0±7.0); 2019 (88.1±10.4); 2020 (82.0±11.5), p<0.001
Biochemistry 2018 (79.7±11.5); 2019 (70.9±17.1); 2020 (74.1±17.3), p<0.001
Histology 2018 (86.2±6.7); 2019 (85.1±12.9); 2020 (83.4±12.0), p=0.0754
Gastrointestinal system 2018 (86.6±8.8); 2019 (88.4±10.5); 2020 (85.9±10.4), p=0.0825
Respiratory system 2018 (78.7±13.1); 2019 (88.2±9.2); 2020 (76.9±11.7), p=0.0001
Circulatory system 2018 (79.2±10.6); 2019 (80.1±10.5); 2020 (77.3±12.1), p=0.0854

Study design
Descriptive study
Post-test

Type of analysis
Analytical statistics
Mean scores

Comparison across two academic years

Quality appraisal rating
5 out of 7

Confidence evaluation
Knowledge – Very low

Knowledge (Mean ± SD)
Final laboratory summative examination 2019 (92± 0.15); 2020 (90± 0.11), p=0.009
### Virtual clerkship in emergency medicine

Microsoft Teams platform for video conferences, news feed with chat functions, class assignments, daily quizzes, and grade book.

Simulated patient encounters employing Online MedEd Case X (Online MedEd, Austin, TX) videos and Emergency Medicine Reviews and Perspectives (EM:RAP) podcast audio of emergency medicine patients and relevant cases

4 weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Type of analysis</th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
<th>Quality appraisal rating</th>
<th>Confidence evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fourth years (Clerkship) (n=48)</td>
<td>Descriptive study</td>
<td>Analytical statistics</td>
<td>Mean scores</td>
<td>Score 4 out of 7</td>
<td>Knowledge – Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth years (Clerkship) (n=56)</td>
<td>Pre-test / Post-test</td>
<td>Comparison across two academic years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Totlis et al., 2021

**Greece**

**Musculoskeletal system anatomy and neuroanatomy**

Skype for Business; the university platform Meducator. Structural specimens replaced by photographs

5 weeks

Online or pre-recorded theoretical lectures and laboratory lectures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Outcome measures</th>
<th>Type of analysis</th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
<th>Quality appraisal rating</th>
<th>Confidence evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic year 2018/2019 In-Person First years studying musculoskeletal anatomy (n=252) Second years studying neuroanatomy (n=211) Academic year 2019/2020 Virtual First years studying musculoskeletal anatomy (n=272) Second years studying neuroanatomy (n=295)</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Analytical statistics</td>
<td>Mean scores</td>
<td>Score of 4 out of 7</td>
<td>Knowledge – Very low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rosenthal et al., 2020

**USA**

Peer led online learning course in emergency medicine

Course content (8 topics) organised by 12 rising fourth-year medical students under supervision of faculty mentor/Director for Undergraduate Medical Education

Online Video Conferencing software

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Outcome measures</th>
<th>Type of analysis</th>
<th>Mean scores</th>
<th>Quality appraisal rating</th>
<th>Confidence evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic year 2019/2020 Fourth years (n=61)</td>
<td>Confidence (Comfort) Imaging Chest pain and EKG Stroke and lumbar puncture Abdominal pain Altered mental status and toxicity Shortness of breath and ventilators Shock and sepsis Trauma and FAST Exams</td>
<td>Analytic statistics</td>
<td>Mean scores</td>
<td>Score 4 out of 7</td>
<td>Confidence– Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-lectures and lectures made use of: Podcasts; Publications, Clinical vignettes, Online content reviews, Video conferencing Platforms not specified</td>
<td>Outcome Measures:</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Overall quiz score (Mean±SD)</td>
<td>Percentage of correct choices Intervention group:(0.67±0.02); Control group (0.60±0.02), p=0.0001 Percentage of incorrect choices Intervention group (0.24±0.19); Control group (0.29 ± 0.223); p=0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Suppan et al., 2021**
Switzerland
Asynchronous distance learning of the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale
Web-based platform e-learning module interactive content, including gamified modules and serious games, which can be accessed on regular computers as well as on smartphones and tablet compared to standard video based learning | Participants
Academic year 2019/2020
Fifth years (75/158, rr 47.5%)
E learning module (n=41)
Video group (n=34)
Outcomes
Knowledge
Outcome measures
50-question quiz | Study design
RCT
Intervention group
E-Learning module
Control group
Video
Type of analysis
Analytical statistics
Mean scores
Quality appraisal rating
Score of 7 out of 11
Confidence evaluation
Moderate | e-learning module (38±3, 95% CI 34-40); video group (35±3, 95% CI 34- 36), p<0.001 |
| **Schmitz et al., 2021**
Germany
Surgical online learning platform
Interactive online platform to teach operative techniques and skills. Surgical procedures were video-recorded in our operating theatre and processed in order to design an interactive video format
Seven educational sessions | Participants
Academic year ns
(n=44/58 completed the study)
Second years (82%)
Intervention group (n=21)
Control group (n=23)
Outcomes
Knowledge
Outcome measures
Online exam consisting of 10 multiple choice questions | Study design
RCT
Intervention group
Video based preparation
Control group
Textbook based preparation
Type of analysis
Analytical statistics
Percentage of correct, incorrect and ‘don’t know’ choices
Quality appraisal rating
Score of 11 out of 11
Confidence evaluation
Very Low | Percentage of correct choices Intervention group (0.67±0.02); Control group (0.60±0.02), p=0.0001 Percentage of incorrect choices Intervention group (0.24±0.19); Control group (0.29 ± 0.223); p=0.04 |
| **Pang et al., 2021**
USA
An Informed Consent activity module within a virtual surgical clerkship
A pre-recorded lecture with presentation slides
A videoconference with 3 students, 2 standardised patients and a facilitator to practice obtaining informed consent for a common surgical procedure | Participants
Academic year 2019/2020
Third years (34/ 90; 38%) who completed the module and took part in the evaluation
Outcomes
Competency in 4 domains:
The ability to identify the key elements of informed consent
The ability to describe common challenges in the informed consent process | Study design
Descriptive study
Pre-test / Post-test (retrospective)
Type of analysis
Analytical statistics
Mean scores
Quality appraisal rating
Score 3 out of 7
Confidence evaluation
Competency – Very low | Results for 4 domains: (Mean±SD) Identifying the elements of informed consent: Pre-test (1.9±1.4); Post-test (3.5±0.93), p<0.001 Describing common challenges in informed consent: Pre-test (1.0±1.15); Post-test (3.3±0.90 ), p<0.001 Applying NM-CCS quality framework: Pre-test (2.1±1.24); Post-test (3.5±0.66), p<0.001 Documenting informed consent: |
| Platforms not specified | The ability to apply the recommended quality framework (NM-CCS)  
The ability document informed consent.  
**Outcome measure**  
Self-assessment 6-point scale (0 being none/no competence and 5 being an extremely high level of competence) | Pre-test (2.0±1.19);  
Post-test (3.4±0.61), p<0.001 |

Key: EKG : Electrocardiogram; FAST: Focused Assessment with Sonography for Trauma; NM-CCS: New Mexico Clinical Communication Scale; RCT: Randomised Controlled Trial

*a* High-fidelity simulation refers to simulation experiences that are extremely realistic and provide a high level of interactivity and realism for the learner
Table 5: Characteristics of included studies focusing on dental students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/s</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kanzow et al., 2021&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt; Germany</td>
<td>Summer term 2020 Students enrolled in the pre-clinical phantom course in operative dentistry (n=33) 31 students were eligible to take the final exam</td>
<td>Descriptive study Post-test</td>
<td>Knowledge Credit (%) awarded in each topic (mean±SD) Cariology, Restorative Dentistry and Preventive Dentistry: 75.8±34.5 Endodontology: 79.2±31.2 Periodontology: 58.9±37.2 Overall credit: 74.5±34.6 Examination items in periodontology showed inferior results compared with other topics (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijakowski et al., 2021&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt; Poland</td>
<td>Academic year 2019/2020 Third years Clinical classes (n=39) Online only classes (n=35) Academic years 2020/2021 Fourth years (n=74)</td>
<td>Descriptive study Post test</td>
<td>Theoretical knowledge (Mean: Q1-Q3) 3rd year (retrospective) 3.0 (3.0 - 4.0); 4th Year 4.0 (4.0-4.0), p=0.001 3rd year (retrospective) In-Person 3.0 (3.0-4.0); 3rd year (retrospective) Virtual 3.0 (3.0-4.0), p=0.702 4th year In-Person 4.0 (4.0-4.0); 4th year Virtual 4.0 (4.0-4.0), p=0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nijakowski et al., 2021&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt; Poland</td>
<td>Blended learning in conservative dentistry with endodontics Blackboard Collaborate 2019/2020 Online classes 2021/2021 Full blended learning, clinical classes, e-learning seminars, and online meetings via Microsoft teams</td>
<td>Descriptive study Post test</td>
<td>Practical skills 3rd year (retrospective) 3.0 (2.0-4.0); 4th Year 4.0 (3.0-4.0), p&lt;0.001 3rd year (retrospective) In-Person 3.0 (2.0-4.0); 3rd year (retrospective) Virtual 2.0 (1.0-2.0), p=0.001 4th year In-Person Year 4.0 (3.0-4.0), 4th year Virtual 3.0 (3.0-4.0), p=0.083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Q: quartiles
### Table 6: Characteristics of included studies focusing on nursing students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/s</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Outcomes/outcome measures</td>
<td>Type of analysis</td>
<td>Competence (Mean±SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(In-Person 11.89±4.31; Virtual 11.67±4.11, p=0.50, effect size 0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrogante et al., 2021</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Clinical judgement and decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Academic year 2018/2019 Fourth years</td>
<td>Descriptive study</td>
<td>(In-Person 10.27±5.39; Virtual 9.84±4.70, p=0.33, effect size 0.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-person OSCEs (n=111)</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Clinical management and nursing care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic year 2019/2020 Fourth years</td>
<td>Analytical statistics</td>
<td>(In-Person 21.08±5.29; Virtual 20.88±5.38, p=0.56, effect size 0.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High fidelity virtual OSCEs (n=123)</td>
<td>Mean scores</td>
<td>Communication and interpersonal relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes Competency</td>
<td>Quality appraisal rating, Score 4 out of 7</td>
<td>(In-Person 12.65±2.75; Virtual 12.13±2.44, p=0.10, effect size 0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Nursing assessment</td>
<td>Competency evaluation</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clinical judgment/decision-making</td>
<td>Competency – Low</td>
<td>(In-Person 12.97±5.20; Virtual 12.45±4.07, p=0.24, effect size 0.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clinical management / nursing care</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Communication / interpersonal relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>(In-Person 68.82±13.96; Virtual 68.13±17.96, p=0.10, p=0.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Checklist of the required nursing competencies in the exacerbation of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawasaki et al., 2021</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Knowledge (Mean±SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Academic year 2019/2020 In-Person Third years (n=46/62, 74.2%)</td>
<td>Descriptive study</td>
<td>In-Person: Pre 19.09±7.03; Post 17.24±16.84, p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-Person Third years (n=46/62, 74.2%)</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Virtual: Pre-test (34.05±8.81); Post-test (91.34±9.05), p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Virtual Third years (n=56/59, 94.9%)</td>
<td>Type of analysis</td>
<td>Mean difference In-Person (52.15±16.47); Virtual (57.29±9.53), p&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes Knowledge</td>
<td>Quality appraisal rating, Score 6 out of 7</td>
<td>Confidence (Mean±SD) In-Person (2.89±0.90; Virtual 3.38±0.91, p=0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidence Competency</td>
<td>Confidence evaluation</td>
<td>Competency (Mean±SD) I am familiar with the term “human genomics” In-Person: Pre (3.13±0.89); Post (4.11±0.80), p&lt;0.001 Virtual: Pre (3.52±0.85); Post (4.52±0.57), p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome measures Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>I can explain diabetes by referring to hereditary and environmental factors In-Person: Pre (2.28±0.83); Post (3.17±0.85), p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genetics knowledge assessment consisting of 12 true/false, 12 fill-in-the-blanks, and 14 essay questions. Points were allocated to each problem for a perfect score of 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Confidence**

Single question
'I gained confidence in human genetic health counselling'

5-point self-assessment
Likert scale was used to assess the attainment of course goals.
1=Not at all true of me;
2=A little true of me;
3=True of me half the time;
4=Quite true of me; and
5=Very true of me

**Competency**

Self assessment question within wider study
I am familiar with the term human genomics
I can explain diabetes by referring to hereditary and environmental factors
I can fully explain human diversity by using genomic information
I can respond to concerns raised by a member of the community by using knowledge of genetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Measure:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>Descriptive study</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Assessment Technologies Institute (ATI) Nursing care of children examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Person (61.91±10.76); Virtual (60.64±12.99%), p=0.485; 95% CI −2.24 to 4.71</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing care of children including foundations of nursing care of children, age-specific developmental expectations, and care for children with chronic conditions and acute illnesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-degree BSN students In-Person (63.95±9.50); Virtual (64.59 ± 11.01), p=0.77; 95% CI −4.93 to 3.65.</td>
<td>Analytical statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second-degree BSN students In-Person (60.13 ±11.55); Virtual (56.06±13.75), p=0.13, 95% CI −1.19 to 9.32</td>
<td>Mean scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All other learning domains non-significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weston and Zauche 2020</th>
<th>Virtual simulation to clinical practice for prelicensure nursing students in pediatrics</th>
<th>Half completed in-person pediatric clinical practice and simulation</th>
<th>Half completed virtually using I-Human <a href="http://www.ihuman.com">www.ihuman.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In-Person simulation Laboratory 5 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual (3.05±0.86); Post (3.91±0.84), p&gt;0.001</td>
<td>I have had the opportunity to obtain accurate information about genomic diseases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Person: (Pre 2.26±0.90); Post (3.74±0.80), p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Virtual: (Pre 2.87±1.01); Post (4.25±0.72), p&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can fully explain human diversity using genomic information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Person: (Pre 1.52±0.62); Post (2.98±0.88), p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Virtual: (Pre 2.07±0.74); Post (4.02±0.80), p&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can respond to concerns raised by a member of the community by using knowledge of genetics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Person: (Pre 1.46±0.55); Post (2.98±0.72), p&lt;0.001</td>
<td>Virtual: (Pre 1.75±0.75); Post (3.46±0.85), p&gt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can fully explain human diversity using genomic information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Person: (Pre 1.46±0.89); Virtual: (1.95±0.92), p=0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other learning domains non-significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ATI: Assessment Technologies Institute; OSCE’s: Objective Structured Clinical Examinations
Table 7: Characteristics of included studies focusing on pharmacy students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/s</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Outcomes / Outcome measures</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Type of analysis</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phillips et al., 2021&lt;sup&gt;39&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Remote delivery of Integrated Patient Care Capstone course</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Academic year 2019/2020 In-person Third (n=134)</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Descriptive study Post test</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic year 2020/2021 60% course completed in person before moving to remote learning Third years (n=126)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020 Spring semester In-Person (7.7 ± 1.8); 2020 summer semester Virtual (8.2 ± 1.6), p&lt;0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Type of analysis</td>
<td>Analytical statistics Mean scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowart and Updike 2021&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Remote delivery of a hypertension/drug information simulation-based learning</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Academic year 2019/2020 First years (n=87)</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Descriptive study Pre-test / Post-test</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Response rate pre-test (95%) Response rate post test (62%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Application of drug information (Pre 3.55±1.06; Post 4.39±0.81; p=0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Type of analysis</td>
<td>Analytical statistics Mean scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blood pressure techniques</td>
<td>Quality appraisal rating</td>
<td>Score 3 out of 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Application of drug information</td>
<td>Confidence evaluation</td>
<td>Confidence – Low Competency – Very low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Mean ±SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcomes / Outcome measures**
- **Knowledge / performance**: Quizzes Mid-term examination result Final examination results
- **Competency & confidence**: 6-item self-assessment scale

**Type of analysis**
- Descriptive study
- Pre-test / Post-test
- Analytical statistics
- Mean scores
- Quality appraisal rating
- Score 3 out of 7

**Findings**
- Knowledge
- Blood pressure techniques
- Application of drug information
- Assessment of communication skills
- Competency

**Confidence evaluation**
- Confidence – Low
- Competency – Very low

**Outcome measures**
- **Competency**
  - 4-point self-assessment Likert scale
  - (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4=strongly agree)
- **Confidence**
  - 5-point self-assessment Likert-scale

**Additional information**
- **Type of analysis**
  - Correlation test, p=0.002
  - Mean scores:
    - 2019 cohort (23.6±5.4; 2020 cohort 21.3±5.4, p<0.01)
    - 2020 Spring semester In-Person (23.1 ± 5.4), 2020 summer semester Virtual (21.3 ± 5.4); p<0.05

**Competency**
- No significant difference in self-assessed skill development when compared between 2019 and 2020 using anonymous course evaluation data (Mann-Whitney U test; p>0)

**Confidence**
- No significant associations were found between level of student confidence in skill development and performance on the final practical exam or in the overall course in 2020 (Spearman Correlation test, p<0.05)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Quality Appraisal Rating</th>
<th>Confidence Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remote delivery of OSCEs in patient counselling and taking a medical history</td>
<td>(0=not at all confident, 1=slightly confident, 2=somewhat confident, 3=moderately confident, 4=very confident)</td>
<td>Score 5 out of 7</td>
<td>Knowledge – Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Type of analysis</td>
<td>Mean scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic year 2019/2020 First years (n=144)</td>
<td>Descriptive test</td>
<td>Analytical statistics</td>
<td>Patient centred communication OSCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic years 2020/2021 First years (n=106)</td>
<td>Post test</td>
<td>Comparison of performance scores between two academic years</td>
<td>Effective verbal and non-verbal communication (p=.001, effect size -.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Skills (Patient centred communication; empathy; trust; professionalism; general verbal and non-verbal communication skills)</td>
<td>Quality appraisal rating</td>
<td>Provided patient friendly education (p=.026, effect size -.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient centred communication OSCE</td>
<td>Outcomes measures</td>
<td>Confidence evaluation</td>
<td>Organizing the encounter (p=.093, effect size -.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students were required to counsel a standardized patient on two prescription products with unique dosage forms (e.g., inhalers). Students’ skills were graded by standardized patients</td>
<td>Cumulative OSCE</td>
<td>Knowledge – Very Low</td>
<td>Cumulative OSCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singh et al., 2021</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Type of analysis</td>
<td>Mean scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual case-based learning elective rotation for Advanced Pharmacy Experience</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Establishing a trusting relationship (p=.000), effect size .0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants were given the opportunity to take on the role of the patient and experience in-person learning with standardized patients.</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Effective verbal and non-verbal communication (p=.001, effect size -.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asynchronous independent work and synchronous video conferencing University Supported Management System: CANVAS</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Provided patient friendly education (p=.026, effect size -.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoom video conferencing platform</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Organizing the encounter (p=.093, effect size -.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Outcome measures</td>
<td>Quality appraisal rating</td>
<td>Confidence evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive study</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Score 4 out of 7</td>
<td>Knowledge – Very Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test / Post test</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td>Confidence – Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Type of analysis</td>
<td>Mean scores</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>SLO: (mean scores)</td>
<td>SLO 1: 76.31%</td>
<td>SLO 1: 76.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean scores</td>
<td>SLO 2: 80.42%</td>
<td>SLO 2: 80.42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality appraisal rating</td>
<td>SLO 3: 76.31%</td>
<td>SLO 3: 76.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score 4 out of 7</td>
<td>SLO 4: 81.14%</td>
<td>SLO 4: 81.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence evaluation</td>
<td>SLO 5: 79.51%</td>
<td>SLO 5: 79.51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>SLO 6: 75.77%</td>
<td>SLO 6: 75.77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The average score for the one graded activity mapped to SLO 5 and SLO 6 was 76.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mean difference in the students’ responses showed a greater than average 10-point improvement in their ability to demonstrate learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Singh et al., 2021
USA
Virtual case-based learning elective rotation for Advanced Pharmacy Experience
Asynchronous independent work and synchronous video conferencing University Supported Management System: CANVAS
Zoom video conferencing platform
6-weeks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLO 6: Develop patient-specific monitoring plans to assess efficacy and safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLO 7: Develop drug-related education materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO 8: Clearly communicate educational materials to preceptors and peers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome Measures:**

- **Confidence**
  - 100-point levelled ability scale with each of five levels of ability spanning a range of 0 to 20

- **Knowledge**
  - Seven graded activities (case-based quizzes, drug consultations and presentations, journal club activities, and the closeout exams) were used to assess the achievement of SLOs, with a target minimum average of 80% as an acceptable level for achieving outcomes

---

[Key: OSCE's: Objective Structured Clinical Examinations; SLO: Student Learning Outcomes]