Content available at: https://www.ipinnovative.com/open-access-journals

Journal of Education Technology in Health Sciences

Journal homepage: https://www.jeths.org/

Review Article

Behind the scenes: Uncovering the downsides of skill and simulation laboratories

Akshaya N Shetti[1]*

[1]*Dept. of Anesthesiology & Critical Care, Dr. Balasaheb Vikhe Patil Rural Medical College, PIMS(DU), Loni, Maharashtra, India*

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 17-06-2024
Accepted 19-07-2024
Available online 27-07-2024

Keywords:
Challenges
High fidelity
Healthcare facility
Skill
Simulation

ABSTRACT

Skill and simulation laboratories have become integral components of modern medical education, offering hands-on training experiences in a controlled environment. While these labs are lauded for their potential to enhance learning and improve patient safety, they are not without their limitations and drawbacks. One of the primary challenges of skill and simulation labs lies in the fidelity of simulation models. While technological advancements have enabled the creation of highly realistic simulators, they often fall short in replicating the complexities and nuances of real-world clinical scenarios. This discrepancy can lead to a false sense of proficiency among learners, who may struggle to translate their skills effectively to clinical practice. Additionally, the cost involved in maintaining high-fidelity simulators and equipment poses a financial burden on educational institutions, limiting access and scalability. Another disadvantage of skill and simulation labs is the potential for simulation bias. Learners may approach simulated scenarios differently from real patient encounters, leading to skewed learning outcomes and overestimation of abilities. Moreover, the standardized nature of simulations may not adequately prepare students for the variability and unpredictability inherent in clinical practice, where factors such as patient diversity, comorbidities, and environmental stressors play significant roles. This review article highlights the disadvantages related to the skill and simulation lab.

1. Introduction

The integration of skill and simulation laboratories into medical education has revolutionized the way healthcare professionals are trained. These laboratories, often equipped with advanced technological tools and lifelike simulators, provide learners with immersive experiences that bridge theoretical knowledge with practical application. From mastering surgical techniques to honing communication skills, skill and simulation labs offer a safe and controlled environment for learners to develop essential competencies crucial for patient care.[1–7]

However, amidst the praise and widespread adoption of skill and simulation labs, it is imperative to critically examine their limitations and potential drawbacks. This introduction sets the stage for uncovering the complexities inherent in skill and simulation laboratories, delving into areas that necessitate nuanced understanding and strategic improvements in medical education.

One of the fundamental challenges associated with skill and simulation labs is the fidelity of simulation models. While advancements in technology have led to the development of increasingly realistic simulators, there remains a gap between simulated scenarios and real-world clinical encounters. The intricacies of patient variability, unexpected complications, and dynamic decision-making processes are difficult to replicate fully in a controlled simulation setting. This dissonance between simulation and reality can impact learners' ability to transfer their skills effectively to clinical practice, raising questions

* *Corresponding author*.
E-mail address: aksnsdr@gmail.com (A. N. Shetti).

https://doi.org/10.18231/j.jeths.2024.008

about the validity and generalizability of simulation-based training.[8–11]

Moreover, the cost implications of maintaining high-fidelity simulators and equipment pose significant financial burdens on educational institutions. The initial investment in acquiring state-of-the-art simulation technology is substantial, and ongoing expenses related to maintenance, updates, and personnel training contribute to the overall cost of operating skill and simulation labs. These financial considerations may limit access to simulation-based learning experiences, particularly for institutions with limited resources, potentially exacerbating disparities in educational opportunities.[12–15]

Another dimension of the discussion revolves around the potential for simulation bias in skill and simulation labs. Learners may approach simulated scenarios differently from real patient encounters, influenced by the structured nature of simulations and predetermined outcomes. This bias can lead to inflated confidence levels among learners, who may underestimate the complexities and uncertainties inherent in clinical decision-making. Furthermore, the standardized nature of simulations may inadvertently promote a "one-size-fits-all" approach to healthcare, overlooking the individualized and context-dependent nature of patient care.

A critical examination of skill and simulation labs also raises ethical considerations regarding the balance between simulated experiences and genuine patient interactions. While simulations offer controlled environments for deliberate practice and skill refinement, they cannot fully replicate the emotional nuances, ethical dilemmas, and humanistic aspects of patient care. The risk of developing a "simulation dependency" among learners, where they prioritize simulated experiences over authentic patient interactions, challenges the holistic development of healthcare professionals and raises questions about the ethical boundaries of simulation-based training.[16]

Furthermore, the educational impact of skill and simulation labs is subject to scrutiny regarding the transferability of skills to real-world settings. While simulations offer opportunities for repetitive practice and error correction, the extent to which skills acquired in a simulated environment translate to improved clinical outcomes remains debated. Studies have highlighted discrepancies between performance in simulation-based assessments and actual patient care, emphasizing the need for comprehensive competency evaluations that encompass diverse clinical scenarios and patient populations.

Addressing the complexities of skill and simulation laboratories in medical education requires a nuanced approach that balances the benefits of simulation with the realities of clinical practice. Strategies such as integrating simulation with clinical rotations, incorporating reflective practice and debriefing sessions, and fostering longitudinal experiences can help bridge the gap between simulation and reality. Moreover, ongoing research, assessment, and refinement of simulation models are essential to ensure their effectiveness in preparing healthcare professionals for the diverse challenges they will encounter in their careers.[17]

2. Expensive High-Fidelity Mannequins

High-fidelity mannequins, touted for their lifelike simulation capabilities, are integral components of many skill and simulation laboratories. These sophisticated mannequins mimic physiological responses, exhibit realistic anatomical features, and allow learners to practice a wide range of clinical procedures in a controlled environment. However, the acquisition and maintenance costs associated with high-fidelity mannequins raise concerns about their cost-effectiveness and long-term sustainability in medical education.

One of the primary challenges of high-fidelity mannequins is the initial investment required for their purchase. These advanced simulators incorporate intricate mechanisms, such as programmable responses, simulated vital signs, and interactive features, making them significantly more expensive than low-fidelity or standardized patient simulators. Educational institutions often face budgetary constraints that limit their ability to procure high-fidelity mannequins, resulting in disparities in access to simulation-based learning experiences.[18–21]

Furthermore, the ongoing costs associated with maintaining and updating high-fidelity mannequins add to the financial burden on educational institutions. Regular calibration, software updates, repair services, and skilled personnel for operating and troubleshooting these simulators contribute to recurring expenses that may strain institutional resources. As a result, some institutions may struggle to justify the continued investment in high-fidelity mannequins, especially when alternative simulation methods or lower-cost simulators are available.

Another consideration is the limited lifespan of high-fidelity mannequins. Despite rigorous maintenance and care, these simulators may experience wear and tear over time, leading to performance degradation or malfunctions. The need for periodic upgrades or replacement of components further adds to the total cost of ownership, raising questions about the sustainability of relying solely on high-fidelity mannequins for simulation-based training.

Moreover, the scalability of high-fidelity mannequins poses logistical challenges for large-scale educational programs. Limited availability of high-fidelity simulators may restrict the number of learners who can access hands-on training opportunities, particularly in settings with high student enrolment or clinical training demands. This scalability issue underscores the importance of exploring alternative simulation modalities or optimizing the utilization of existing resources to accommodate diverse learning needs.

Addressing the cost-effectiveness of high-fidelity mannequins requires a strategic approach that balances educational objectives with budgetary considerations. Institutions may explore collaborative partnerships, grant opportunities, or innovative funding models to acquire high-fidelity simulators while mitigating financial constraints. Additionally, incorporating cost-benefit analyses and return on investment assessments can inform decision-making processes regarding the selection, utilization, and maintenance of simulation equipment.[22]

3. Challenges to Demonstrate the Scenarios Using Simulation

Demonstrating scenarios using simulation presents several challenges that can impact the effectiveness and realism of the learning experience. Let's delve into an example scenario and explore the challenges it may pose in simulation-based training. Here are some examples, managing a code blue emergency; in a hospital setting, a code blue emergency refers to a situation where a patient experiences cardiac arrest and requires immediate resuscitation efforts. Simulating a code blue scenario in a skill and simulation laboratory involves recreating the critical steps and decision-making processes that healthcare professionals would encounter in a real-life emergency.[23–27]

4. Challenges to Demonstrate the Scenario using Simulation

1. **Realism of environment:** One of the primary challenges is creating a realistic environment that accurately mimics the chaos and urgency of a code blue situation. While simulation labs can replicate clinical settings to some extent, factors such as ambient noise, team dynamics, and spatial constraints may be challenging to emulate. Without an authentic environment, learners may not fully appreciate the complexity and stressors associated with managing a code blue emergency.
2. **Dynamic patient responses:** Simulating the physiological responses of a patient in cardiac arrest requires sophisticated simulation technology, particularly high-fidelity mannequins capable of simulating vital signs, cardiac rhythms, and responses to interventions. Achieving accurate and dynamic patient responses adds complexity to the simulation and requires skilled simulation operators to adjust scenarios based on learner actions. Inadequate fidelity in patient responses can diminish the realism of the simulation and impact learning outcomes.
3. **Interprofessional collaboration:** Code blue emergencies necessitate coordinated efforts among multidisciplinary healthcare teams, including physicians, nurses, respiratory therapists, and other support staff. Simulating effective interprofessional collaboration poses challenges in terms of coordinating actions, communication protocols, and role delineation within the simulation scenario. Without clear guidance and structured debriefing, learners may struggle to understand their roles and responsibilities in a team-based emergency response.
4. **Time sensitivity and decision-making:** Managing a code blue emergency requires rapid decision-making under time pressure. Simulating time-sensitive interventions, such as cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR), defibrillation, medication administration, and airway management, necessitates precise timing and sequencing within the simulation. Balancing the realism of time-sensitive actions with the controlled nature of simulation scenarios can be challenging and may require scripted cues or simulation facilitators to guide the pace of the scenario.
5. **Emotional and psychological aspects:** Code blue emergencies evoke strong emotional and psychological responses among healthcare providers, including stress, anxiety, and adrenaline surges. Simulating the emotional impact of such scenarios adds another layer of complexity, as learners must have their own emotional reactions while maintaining focus on patient care. Creating a safe space for learners to address emotional responses and debrief effectively is crucial but requires sensitivity and expertise from simulation facilitators.

Another example is, the patient and relatives involved in conflict with healthcare workers.

Simulating scenarios involving patient-provider conflicts, particularly situations where a patient adamantly refuses hospital stay and engages in conflict with healthcare providers, presents multifaceted challenges that require nuanced approaches in simulation-based training. One of the primary challenges lies in capturing the emotional intensity and complexity of such interactions. Simulating authentic emotions, including the patient's frustration, fear, or anger, and the healthcare providers' efforts to influence these emotions while upholding professional standards and patient safety, requires skilled actors or simulation participants capable of realistic portrayal.[28–30]

Effective communication skills are pivotal in managing patient-provider conflicts, yet simulating realistic dialogue and communication exchanges presents its own set of challenges. From active listening and empathy to assertiveness and conflict resolution techniques, healthcare providers must overcome complex communication dynamics during conflict scenarios. Simulating these nuances demands structured scenarios, trained facilitators, and feedback mechanisms to assess participants' communication proficiency and decision-making abilities under pressure.

Ethical and legal considerations add another layer of complexity to simulating patient-provider conflicts. Addressing the ethical implications of a patient's decision to leave against medical advice (AMA), informed consent principles, patient autonomy, and duty of care obligations requires scenario design that incorporates ethical dilemmas, decision-making processes, and legal ramifications. Educators must ensure that simulation scenarios strike a balance between realism and ethical guidelines, providing learners with opportunities to grapple with ethical dilemmas in a controlled environment.

Safety and security considerations are paramount in simulating conflict scenarios to prevent physical confrontations or safety risks. Simulation facilitators must adhere to safety protocols, conduct risk assessments, and establish clear guidelines for simulation participants to prevent harm or injury. Balancing realism with participant safety is crucial, and facilitators must intervene as necessary to ensure that simulations remain educational and constructive while avoiding potential harm to participants.

To address these challenges effectively, educators can implement strategies such as developing realistic scenarios, training simulation participants in authentic portrayal and communication skills, integrating ethical and legal considerations into scenario design, conducting structured debriefing sessions, and utilizing simulation technology to enhance realism and accessibility. By preparing healthcare professionals to help patient-provider conflicts skillfully, ethically, and safely, simulation-based training contributes to the development of competent and compassionate healthcare teams capable of managing challenging interactions with professionalism and empathy.

5. Similar Type of Simulation Mannequin May Not Fit for All Part of the Word

There are several elements one should consider possible conflicts in simulation-based training.

Firstly, addressing cultural competence adds depth to simulation scenarios. Including scenarios that explore cultural differences, language barriers, and culturally sensitive communication enhances learners' ability to understand diverse patient populations effectively. This aspect fosters empathy, understanding, and improved communication across cultural boundaries, crucial in providing patient-centered care.[31]

Secondly, incorporating psychosocial factors broadens the scope of learning in simulation scenarios. These factors include mental health issues, substance use disorders, socioeconomic factors, and social determinants of health. By including these elements, learners can practice empathetic communication, stigma reduction, and holistic care approaches when addressing psychosocial challenges in patient interactions.

Thirdly, emphasizing teamwork and collaboration among multidisciplinary healthcare teams enhances learners' understanding of interprofessional roles, responsibilities, and communication strategies. Simulating scenarios that require coordinated teamwork, shared decision-making, and conflict resolution among team members fosters a culture of collaboration and patient-centered care, improving overall healthcare outcomes.

Fourthly, highlighting the principles of patient-centered care in conflict resolution is crucial. This involves respecting patient autonomy, involving patients in decision-making, and addressing patients' preferences, values, and goals of care. Simulation scenarios focused on eliciting patient perspectives, negotiating shared treatment plans, and fostering therapeutic alliances can significantly enhance patient-provider relationships.

Furthermore, providing training in de-escalation techniques and crisis intervention strategies equips healthcare providers with skills to manage challenging situations effectively. Simulated scenarios can include opportunities for practicing de-escalation, conflict resolution, and calming strategies, promoting safe and respectful interactions with patients in distress.

Delving deeper into ethical dilemmas and moral reasoning in patient-provider conflicts encourages critical thinking and ethical decision-making skills among learners. Simulation scenarios can explore ethical challenges related to patient autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, justice, and professional integrity, fostering ethical awareness and ethical reasoning abilities.

Lastly, acknowledging the emotional impact of patient-provider conflicts and providing training in resilience-building and self-care strategies promotes well-being among healthcare providers. Incorporating elements of self-reflection, stress management, mindfulness, and peer support in simulation-based training fosters resilience, reduces burnout, and enhances professional satisfaction.

6. Debriefing is an Art and Subjective; has Challenge in Simulation-based Training as Limited People are Trained in it

Debriefing is a critical component of simulation-based training in healthcare education, serving as a platform for reflection, feedback, and learning integration. However, debriefing is not merely a procedural step; it is an art that requires skill, sensitivity, and adaptability. The subjective nature of debriefing poses challenges in simulation-based training, particularly as the number of individuals trained in effective debriefing practices remains limited.

One of the fundamental aspects of debriefing as an art form is its subjectivity. Each debriefing session is unique, shaped by the participants involved, the simulation scenario, and the learning objectives. Debriefers must take into consideration of varying perspectives, communication

styles, and learning preferences, tailoring their approach to meet the diverse needs of learners. This subjectivity underscores the importance of debriefers' expertise, empathy, and ability to create a safe and constructive learning environment.

In simulation-based training, debriefing serves multiple purposes, including knowledge consolidation, skill enhancement, error analysis, and emotional processing. Effective debriefing goes beyond factual recounting; it delves into the underlying thought processes, decision-making rationale, and emotional responses of participants during simulated scenarios. This depth of reflection requires debriefers to employ active listening, open-ended questioning, and facilitation techniques that encourage self-discovery and critical thinking among learners.

However, the challenge arises from the limited number of individuals trained in debriefing techniques. Not all healthcare educators, simulation facilitators, or clinical experts receive formal training in debriefing methodologies. As a result, debriefing sessions may lack consistency, depth, or effectiveness, hindering the intended learning outcomes of simulation-based training initiatives. The gap in debriefing skills and expertise highlights the need for comprehensive training programs and ongoing professional development in debriefing practices.

Training in debriefing encompasses various aspects, including debriefing models, communication strategies, feedback delivery, emotional intelligence, cultural competence, and debriefing facilitation techniques. Debriefer training programs should emphasize active learning, experiential practice, peer feedback, and reflective supervision to enhance debriefing skills and promote continuous improvement. Additionally, debriefers must stay updated with best practices, innovations in simulation technology, and evolving educational methodologies to adapt their debriefing approaches effectively.

Creating a psychologically safe environment where learners feel comfortable sharing experiences, expressing vulnerabilities, and receiving constructive feedback is essential for meaningful debriefing outcomes. Debriefer training should address strategies for building trust, managing group dynamics, addressing conflicts, and promoting inclusivity and respect in debriefing sessions.

Another challenge in debriefing is managing emotions and addressing psychological aspects that arise during simulation-based training. Simulated scenarios can evoke strong emotional responses, stress, and anxiety among learners, particularly when confronting challenging or high-stakes situations. Debriefers must possess emotional intelligence, empathy, and resilience to deliver these emotions effectively, provide psychological support, and facilitate reflective processing without causing distress or harm to participants.

7. How to Overcome the Debriefing Challenge?

Debriefing in simulation-based training can be significantly improved through various strategies that focus on enhancing debriefers' skills, refining debriefing methodologies, and creating a more conducive learning environment. One key aspect is providing comprehensive training and ongoing professional development for debriefers. This includes equipping them with debriefing models, communication techniques, feedback delivery skills, emotional intelligence, and cultural competence. By enhancing debriefers' capabilities, they can facilitate more meaningful and effective debriefing sessions that promote reflective learning, critical thinking, and skill integration among participants.

Another approach to improving debriefing is the incorporation of structured debriefing models and frameworks. These models, such as the PEARLS (Promoting Excellence and Reflective Learning in Simulation) or the Debriefing with Good Judgment approach, provide a structured framework for debriefing sessions, guiding debriefers in organizing discussions, eliciting participant reflections, analyzing performance, and identifying areas for improvement. Adopting evidence-based debriefing models ensures consistency, depth, and efficacy in debriefing practices, leading to more impactful learning outcomes.

Utilizing technology and innovative debriefing tools can also enhance the debriefing process. Digital debriefing platforms, video recording systems, debriefing checklists, and real-time feedback mechanisms can streamline debriefing sessions, improve feedback delivery, and facilitate data-driven analysis of participant performance. These technological advancements not only enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of debriefing but also provide opportunities for remote debriefing, asynchronous learning, and performance analytics, expanding access to high-quality debriefing experiences.

Furthermore, fostering a culture of psychological safety, inclusivity, and respect in debriefing sessions is essential for creating a conducive learning environment. Debriefer training programs should emphasize strategies for building trust, managing power differentials, addressing conflicts, promoting open communication, and valuing diverse perspectives. By prioritizing participants' emotional well-being, encouraging active participation, and creating a supportive debriefing atmosphere, debriefers can facilitate deeper reflection, self-awareness, and collaborative learning among participants.

Continuous quality improvement and feedback loops are integral to debriefing improvement efforts. Establishing debriefing quality metrics, conducting debriefing evaluations, soliciting participant feedback, and engaging in peer debriefing reviews promote ongoing reflection, learning, and refinement of debriefing practices.

Incorporating feedback mechanisms into debriefing sessions encourages debriefers to adapt their approaches, address areas for improvement, and enhance the overall quality of debriefing experiences.

8. Conclusion

The skill and simulation laboratories reveal a spectrum of challenges and considerations that warrant thoughtful examination. While these laboratories are instrumental in modern medical education, offering controlled environments for hands-on learning and skill development, they are not without drawbacks. While simulation can enhance learner confidence, procedural proficiency, and teamwork skills, it should complement rather than replace clinical experiences. Balancing the benefits and limitations of skill and simulation laboratories is crucial to ensuring a well-rounded and effective educational approach.

9. Sources of Funding

None.

10. Conflict of Interest

None.

References

1. Mcgaghie WC, Issenberg SB, Cohen ER, Barsuk JH, Wayne DB. Does simulation-based medical education with deliberate practice yield better results than traditional clinical education? A meta-analytic comparative review of the evidence. *Acad Med*. 2011;86(6):706–11.
2. Mcdougall EM. Validation of surgical simulators. *J Endourol*. 2007;21(3):244–7.
3. Stefanidis D, Acker CE, Greene FL. Performance goals on simulators boost resident motivation and skills laboratory attendance. *J Surg Educ*. 2010;67(2):66–70.
4. Ziv A, Ben-David S, Ziv M. Simulation based medical education: an opportunity to learn from errors. *Med Teach*. 2005;27(3):193–9.
5. Issenberg SB, Mcgaghie WC, Petrusa ER, Gordon DL, Scalese RJ. Features and uses of high-fidelity medical simulations that lead to effective learning: a BEME systematic review. *Med Teach*. 2005;27(1):10–28.
6. Cook DA, Hatala R, Brydges R. Technology-enhanced simulation for health professions education: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 2011;306(9):978–88.
7. Kneebone R. Simulation in surgical training: educational issues and practical implications. *Med Educ*. 2003;37(3):267–77.
8. Wayne DB, Didwania A, Feinglass J, Fudala MJ, Barsuk JH, Mcgaghie WC. Simulation-based education improves quality of care during cardiac arrest team responses at an academic teaching hospital: a case-control study. *Chest*. 2008;133(1):56–61.
9. Savoldelli GL, Naik VN, Park J, Joo HS, Chow R, Hamstra SJ. Value of debriefing during simulated crisis management: oral versus video-assisted oral feedback. *Anesthesiology*. 2006;105(2):279–85.
10. Weller JM, Janssen AL, Merry AF, Robinson BJ. Interdisciplinary team interactions: a qualitative study of perceptions of team function in simulated anaesthesia crises. *Med Educ*. 2008;42(4):382–8.
11. Aggarwal R, Mytton OT, Derbrew M, Hananel D, Heydenburg M. Training and simulation for patient safety. *Qual Saf Health Care*. 2010;19(2):34–43.
12. Gaba DM. The future vision of simulation in health care. *Qual Saf Health Care*. 2004;13(1):2–10.
13. Aebersold M, Tschannen D, Bathish M. Innovative simulation strategies in education. *Nurs Res Pract*. 2012;2012:765212.
14. Bradley P. The history of simulation in medical education and possible future directions. *Med Educ*. 2006;40(3):254–62.
15. Harder BN. Use of simulation in teaching and learning in health sciences: a systematic review. *J Nurs Educ*. 2010;49(1):23–8.
16. Lateef F. Simulation-based learning: Just like the real thing. *J Emerg Trauma Shock*. 2010;3(4):348–52.
17. Murray DJ. Current trends in simulation training in anesthesia: a review. *Minerva Anestesiol*. 2011;77(5):528–33.
18. Al-Elq AH. Simulation-based medical teaching and learning. *J Family Community Med*. 2010;17(1):35–40.
19. Hegland PA, Aarlie H, Strømme H, Jamtvedt G. Simulation-based training for nurses: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nurse Educ Today*. 2017;54:6–20.
20. Motola I, Devine LA, Chung HS, Sullivan JE, Issenberg SB. Simulation in healthcare education: a best evidence practical guide. AMEE Guide No. 82. *Med Teach*. 2013;35(10):e1511–30.
21. Mcgaghie WC, Issenberg SB, Petrusa ER, Scalese RJ. Revisiting 'A critical review of simulation-based medical education research. *Med Educ*. 2016;50(10):986–91.
22. Waxman KT. The development of evidence-based clinical simulation scenarios: guidelines for nurse educators. *J Nurs Educ*. 2010;49(1):29–35.
23. Qayumi K, Pachev G, Zheng B, Ziv A, Koval V, Badiei S, et al. Status of simulation in health care education: an international survey. *Adv Med Educ Pract*. 2014;5:457–67.
24. Okuda Y, Bryson EO, Demaria S, Jacobson L, Quinones J, Shen B, et al. The utility of simulation in medical education: what is the evidence? *Mt Sinai J Med*. 2009;76(4):330–43.
25. Gaba DM, Howard SK, Fish KJ, Smith BE, Sowb YA. Simulation-based training in anesthesia crisis resource management (ACRM): a decade of experience. *Simul Gaming*. 2001;32(2):175–93.
26. Gordon JA, Wilkerson WM, Shaffer DW, Armstrong EG. Practicing" medicine without risk: students' and educators' responses to high-fidelity patient simulation. *Acad Med*. 2001;76(5):469–72.
27. Mcgaghie WC. Research opportunities in simulation-based medical education using deliberate practice. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2008;15(11):995–1001.
28. Eppich W, Cheng A. Promoting excellence and reflective learning in simulation (PEARLS): development and rationale for a blended approach to health care simulation debriefing. *Simul Healthc*. 2015;10(2):106–15.
29. Rudolph JW, Raemer DB, Simon R. Establishing a safe container for learning in simulation: the role of the presimulation briefing. *Simul Healthc*. 2014;9(6):339–49.
30. Shapiro M, Morey J, Small S, Langford V, Kaylor C, Jagminas L, et al. Simulation-based teamwork training for emergency department staff: does it improve clinical team performance when added to an existing didactic teamwork curriculum? Qual Saf Health Care. *Qual Saf Health Care*. 2004;13(6):417–21.
31. Ahmed K, Jawad M, Abboudi M. Effectiveness of procedural simulation in urology: a systematic review. *J Urol*. 2011;186(1):26–34.

Author biography

Akshaya N Shetti, Professor and HOD

Cite this article: Shetti AN. Behind the scenes: Uncovering the downsides of skill and simulation laboratories. *J Educ Technol Health Sci* 2024;11(2):36-41.