

ARTICLE REFERENCES	OBJECTIVES	OUTCOME MEASURES	MAIN FINDINGS
Abelson et al., 2015 <sup>(40)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine feasibility of creating a VR operating room</li> <li>Evaluate simulator for face and construct validity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construct validity : metric data</li> <li>Face validity : Likert-scale questionnaires (realism, inclination to use), Bedford Workload Scale and modified NASA-Task Load Index scale</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training environment evaluated as realistic</li> <li>82% of participants felt low workload or had enough spare capacity for additional tasks. All participants had minimal mental, physical, and temporal demand and none reported requiring a high amount of effort to complete the simulation</li> <li>No statistically significant difference between attendings and trainees for all responses</li> </ul>
Brewin et al., 2015 <sup>(24)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess validity of distributed simulation environment for NTS training</li> <li>Evaluate educational impact</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Face, content and construct validity : questionnaires</li> <li>NOTECHS</li> <li>Educational impact : questionnaires completed after the simulations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good learning environment for NTS, judged realistic</li> <li>NTS of experienced urologists significantly better than trainees establishing construct validity</li> <li>All trainees felt more confident</li> <li>Kirkpatrick level 1 evidence and indirect evidence of learning (Kirkpatrick level 2)</li> </ul>
Brunckhorst et al., 2015 <sup>(25)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate feasibility, acceptability, content validity and educational impact of simulation-based curriculum integrating NTS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NOTSS</li> <li>Content validity : post-study questionnaire</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>100 % of experts agreed integration of full immersion simulation was a useful tool for teaching non-technical skills</li> <li>Curriculum-trained group : significantly higher NOTSS scores than control group</li> <li>Feasibility of delivery of the curriculum was rated 9.27/10, enjoyment and productivity was scored at 9/10, difficulty of curriculum rated 4.93/10</li> </ul>
Cohen et al., 2013 <sup>(41)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine feasibility and reliability of skills assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7-point NTS competency scale for paramedics and T-NOTECHS (Trauma Non-Technical Skills Scale)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant and strong correlations between expert assessors suggest reliability to carry out NTS assessments in virtual environments in major incident scenarios</li> <li>No significant correlations between expert and self-assessment for NTS</li> </ul>
Creutzfeldt et al., 2010 <sup>(26)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate (SA) Situation Awareness self assessment instrument</li> <li>Analyze SA training in virtual settings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SA : 9-items questionnaire + trainee's own opinion of his or her SA during training</li> <li>Concentration/attention : 10-items instrument</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SA increased from the first to the last scenario</li> <li>Perception of SA corresponded to calculated SA</li> <li>Correlation between SA and concentration</li> </ul>
Dorozhkin et al., 2016 <sup>(42)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish face validity, usefulness and fidelity of virtual OR fire</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perceived usefulness and face validity : questionnaire</li> <li>Open-ended questions : improvements and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Face validity established with high degree of satisfaction and usefulness</li> <li>33/49 participants preferred this modality of training over a traditional one</li> <li>47% of subjects offered suggestions on how to make the simulator look and feel more realistic</li> </ul>

	training module in VEST simulator	preferences	
Greci et al., 2013 <sup>(27)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop and evaluate a virtual learning curriculum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Open-ended questions : technical challenges, course content, immersion</li> <li>Interviews and focus groups</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All students improved postcourse disaster preparedness knowledge scores</li> <li>Emerging themes : team communication, team planning, team decision making</li> <li>Functioning in an unfamiliar environment was evaluated as requiring similar skills as during a disaster where rapid decision making with incomplete information</li> </ul>
Grover et al., 2015 <sup>(28)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Validate a simulation-based curriculum for cognitive and integrative competencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Global performance : Integrated Scenario Global Rating Form (ISGRF)</li> <li>Communication skills : Communication Global Rating Scale (CGRS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants significantly outperformed control group with respect to colonoscopy-specific performance, communication skills and global performance during the integrated scenario format assessment 4 to 6 weeks after training</li> </ul>
Heinrichs et al., 2010 <sup>(43)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine efficiency of a Virtual Emergency Department to train mass-casualty incidents (team skills)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Immersion, level of comfort, confidence, usefulness for clinical skills and team training : questionnaire</li> <li>Focus group</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>68% of the participants felt immersed</li> <li>Everyone felt they learned how to interact in the simulation</li> <li>"Useful", "Very Useful", or "Extremely Useful" for clinical skills training for 82% participants</li> <li>Participants gained confidence in ability to handle incidents</li> </ul>
Hudson et al. , 2015 <sup>(44)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examine perceived usability of Second Life (SL) as an immersive virtual environment</li> <li>Study clinical decisions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Perceived usability : System Usability Scale (SUS)</li> <li>Situation awareness : questionnaire with 27 items</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SL considered usable in providing practice with complex scenarios of insulin administration. Perceived usability decreased among experienced nurses</li> <li>No significant association between years of nursing experience and SA scores was found.</li> </ul>
Khan et al., 2017 <sup>(29)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate effectiveness of a simulation-based training curriculum of NTS on novice endoscopists' performance of clinical colonoscopy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modified Objective Structured Assessment NTS (M-OSANTS)</li> <li>ISGRF</li> <li>Integrated Scenario Communication Rating Form (ISCRF)</li> <li>General Self Efficacy Scale (GSE)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To inform the potential implementation of NTS into postgraduate gastrointestinal curricula, non-technical performance will be determined by comparing the scores from the M-OSANTS, ISGRF, ISCRF and GSE for both conditions and at 3 different times</li> </ul>

Khanal et al., 2014 <sup>(30)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate efficacy of delivering advanced cardiac life support (ACLS) using a virtual reality simulator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Team performance : electronic checklist based on ACLS guidelines assessed by experts</li> <li>Final questionnaire on training experience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No statistically significant difference in improvement of skills between groups</li> <li>VR-based ACLS training simulator is significantly cheaper, easier to organize, and facilitates users to practice in a team from disparate locations without requiring an evaluator</li> </ul>
King et al., 2012 <sup>(45)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate usability of the environment</li> <li>Evaluate learning effectiveness of scenarios</li> <li>Evaluate integration into curriculum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Debriefing: exploration of team interactions</li> <li>Satisfaction survey and questions on learning in the environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students appreciated to visualize the Emergency Room setting in a low-pressure situation</li> <li>It provided students with opportunities to communicate with other disciplines, which they would not have had until in clinical practice</li> <li>Students felt it was great preparation for non-virtual scenarios for clinical situations</li> </ul>
Maschuw et al., 2008 <sup>(31)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explore impact of self-belief of surgeons on laparoscopic performance using a VR simulator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General Self Efficacy (GSE) score</li> <li>Technical metrics : time, economy of motion and damage parameters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No significant differences were found in gender or in GSE score between both groups</li> <li>Motions of advanced trainees were more economic than novices, but no significant difference in time, error score and right instrument movements.</li> <li>Novices GSE scores negatively correlates with economy of motion and time, while for advanced residents it is independent of laparoscopic performance</li> </ul>
Paige et al., 2007 <sup>(46)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate perception of simulated scenarios</li> <li>Evaluate effectiveness for communication and teamwork during OR crisis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teamwork assessment: communication, coordination and situational awareness</li> <li>Questionnaire on perception of training effectiveness and specific attributes of teamwork</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sessions were found effective/very effective for improving teamwork, communication and recognizing problems in the OR</li> </ul>
Riesen et al., 2012 <sup>(32)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve interprofessional competencies</li> <li>Determine acceptability of a blended learning environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Self-perceived changes in interprofessional attitudes and competence : IEPS, ICCAS</li> <li>Team performance assessment : TOSCE</li> <li>Students perceptions : program assessment tool, and 16-item questionnaire</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant differences pre and post workshop were found in ICCAS and IEPS scores</li> <li>Significant improvement across the 3 simulations in all competencies</li> <li>Program and learning experience were highly rated</li> <li>Learner confidence and performance can be improved through education delivered in a virtual environment</li> </ul>
Rogers, 2011 <sup>(49)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigate how a simulation in Second</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual interviews: clinical judgement,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critical Life simulation is an artificial social structure where problem-based scenarios can be created</li> </ul>

	Life can encourage teamwork and collaborative problem solving	teamwork and interpersonal skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students can co-construct mental models experiencing human interaction in problematic environment</li> <li>• Critical Life could develop cognitive understanding of team-orientated procedural and problem-based decision-making skills.</li> </ul>
Rudarakanchana et al., 2014 <sup>(33)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate feasibility of integration of a VR simulator in an immersive</li> <li>• Investigate construct and face validity for training human factor skills during a crisis scenario</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questionnaires : realism (face validity) and potential for use in team training for both technical and human factor skills</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experienced team leaders were significantly faster than trainees</li> <li>• Realism of the environment was scored very high and realism of the VR simulator was rated high</li> <li>• Trainees rated the simulation more useful for technical skills training, and experts believed it more useful in enhancing communication skills</li> <li>• Feasibility, face and construct validity of a realistic crisis scenario integrating a VR simulator has been shown</li> </ul>
Sankaranarayana n et al., 2016 <sup>(34)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish face and construct validity of an immersive VR system</li> <li>• Assess the effects of distractions and task interruptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5-point Likert-scale subjective feedback questionnaire : realism, immersive experience, and effects of distractions and interruptions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance decreased with added distractions and interruptions</li> <li>• Subjects rated interruptions very high in their ability to affect performance and music distraction received the lowest mean rating</li> <li>• Simulators rated as realistic to present distractions and interruptions in a simulated OR, immersion evaluated as intermediate.</li> </ul>
Shamim Khan et al., 2013 <sup>(35)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish feasibility and acceptability of simulation training for NTS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews : perception of simulated environment</li> <li>• Feasibility, acceptability and construct validity : questionnaires</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construct-validity established : Seniors performed significantly better than junior trainees in all simulation sessions</li> <li>• Increased cognitive load for trainees on VR simulator : pressure/anxiety about the unknown and interplay between technical and non-technical skills</li> </ul>
Sweigart et al., 2016 <sup>(36)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Test utility and acceptability of a virtual learning environment (VLE)</li> <li>• Examine change in teamwork attitudes in interprofessional communication</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effectiveness : TeamSTEPPS -TAQ (Teamwork Attitude Questionnaire)</li> <li>• Utility : Time to complete scenarios and answers to questions within scenarios</li> <li>• Acceptability : Likert-scale type questions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive student feedback on ease of use and perceived effectiveness for teaching communication and professionalism t</li> <li>• Scores on the T-TAQ revealed significant positive changes in leadership, situation monitoring, mutual support, and communication</li> </ul>
Umoren et al., 2017 <sup>(48)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Propose an introduction to TeamSTEPPS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MCQ questions during the progression of the scenarios : designation of a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learner recognition of the SBAR communication tool was high across groups</li> <li>• Knowledge of which component of SBAR was missing was lower across</li> </ul>

	communication tools for nursing and medical students	TeamSTEPPS strategy, identification of a missing component of this strategy and possible selection of another strategy	groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students demonstrated increased correct recognition of strategies as they progressed through the scenarios</li> <li>When they had the choice, students were more likely to chose the Two-Challenge Rule than the CUS</li> </ul>
White et al., 2015 <sup>(47)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Study quality of information transfer and teamwork during a simulated critical event</li> <li>Assess gathering and sharing of critical information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communication skills: Critical Patient Information checklist and Interprofessional Communication Skills checklist</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A substantial percentage of participants did not share 3 critical items and 87% of the participants missed a dosage error</li> <li>Items on Communication Checklist were missed by a substantial number of participants (introduction of self and task, closed-loop communication)</li> <li>No statistically significant relationship between scores and years of nursing</li> <li></li> </ul>
Willaert et al., 2011 <sup>(37)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate whether a part-task rehearsal of a surgical procedure on a VR simulator is as effective as a full-task one</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-technical skills : NOTSS</li> <li>Face validity and usefulness : questionnaire</li> <li>Emotional, cognitive and physical stress : short version of State Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI) questionnaire</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both groups scored acceptable scores in all categories of NOTSS</li> <li>Simulated procedure was found highly realistic. Simulation helped participants in decision-making, confidence, reduction of anxiety, and communication. Both strategies were as effective on stress levels</li> <li>For a moderately difficult case, a part-task patient specific VR rehearsal is as effective as a full-task one</li> </ul>
Wucherer et al., 2015 <sup>(38)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Measure usability of simulator</li> <li>Explore relationship between mental workload and surgical performance during crisis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cognitive workload : 3-item questionnaire and Surgery Task Load Index (SURG-TLX)</li> <li>Questionnaire : face validity and training value</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training resulted in a decrease of time, but significantly slower performances when crises</li> <li>The more workload was experienced, the poorer was the surgical performance.</li> <li>Telephone call seemed more disturbing compared to patient discomfort</li> </ul>
Youngblood et al., 2008 <sup>(39)</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate VLE for leadership and trauma management by comparing users' experience with a high-fidelity patient simulator (PS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leadership skills : EMCRM (Emergency Medicine Crisis Resource Management) scale</li> <li>Assessment of learning experience : debriefing and questionnaire</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All participants evaluated simulation as “useful” or “very useful” to assess and manage trauma patients in Emergency Department (ED)</li> <li>All participants showed significant improvement in team leadership</li> <li>Students emphasized emotional impact of simulation in VLE</li> <li>Both mannequin-based and VLE simulation of ED cases are valid training methods to improve EMCRM team leadership skills</li> </ul>