DOI: https://doi.org/10.53350/pjmhs20231741

**EDITORIAL**

# Professional Medical Exams: Patient Engagement and Ethico-Legal A Considerations

ABDUL GHANI RAHIMOON[1], SYED ZULFIQUAR ALI SHAH[1], KASHIFULLAH SHABIR[1], SABA MEMON[2], SAMAR RAZA[1], SURHAN UZAIR[1], SABIHA ARAIN[2]
*[1]Liaquat University of Medical and Health Sciences (LUMHS) Jamshoro*
*[2]Liaquat University Hospital, Hyderabad*
*Correspondence to Dr. Syed Zulfiquar Ali Shah, Email: zulfikar229@hotmail.com*

Patients have been part of medical education since recruits trained. Healthcare students learn by seeing several patients. They should examine patients well to pass their finals. Live patients have been considered to validate undergraduate assessment more than actors and manikins and abnormal findings[1]. They reduce the requirement for skepticism when studying simulated patients. Staff, candidates, and patients approve of patients evaluating final-year students' skills[2]. Real patients are cheap and sometimes available. Patients now are engaged in undergraduate and postgraduate education and evaluation. The legal and moral rights and obligations of participants in educational settings are not well established[3].

In our knowledge recruitment and selection and monitoring patient populations in many academic settings, we are frequently did strike by a lack of specific plans for more supervision of a doctor once chosen, despite the fact that they were selected due to being ill or have unusual visible signs; some might be medically unsteady, and we have witnessed adverse outcomes influencing patients during assessment[4].

Real-patient literature has focused on realities like enhancing patient satisfaction and meeting assessment requirements. Participating in this subject has not been sufficiently explored ethically or legally. We hypothesized that a clinician's or institution's responsibility to a patient visiting purely for instruction has never been established[5]. Exams for students are often given in academic institutions these days that can be separate from hospitals or trusts and have different insurance. The depth of clinical care in these centers may not be as good as it would be in a medical ward[6]. Individuals with no medical training may find and watch over patients. Also, the way things are now calls for accountability and stresses how important agreement and privacy are in all parts of patient safety[7].

Consent granted by a competent individual is only considered valid if it is fully informed, freely offered, and ongoing. Although nearly half of institutions feel they are asking consent from patients, most restrict the data provided to learners about the assessment in which they are to participate to practicalities. The competency of adults is presumed except in cases of reasonable suspicion, in which case an evaluation should be conducted using standard standards[8]. Concerns concerning privacy and security are raised by the fact that most medical schools keep records on the patients who serve as case studies for graduate exams. Both medical and administrative personnel often have knowledge of patient files. In fact, in over half of the schools, the full medical history of a patient is made available, which is far more information than is typically needed to organize an evaluation for pupils. Institutions of medicine need to be conscious of the obligations they have[9].

It has been made abundantly plain by regulatory bodies like the Licensing Board and the Health Commission that all physicians have an ethical obligation to offer the minimum level of care that a patient would expect to receive in an emergency[10]. The emergency responders provided anything from basic pain relief to full resuscitate equipment and intravenous medication administration. Should the organizers be responsible for providing a qualified individual to operate the necessary equipment and deliver any available treatment for the length of the each individual exam? Event organizers must methods to not only handle unpleasant situations, but also report them to the appropriate medical staff. Whoever is in charge of coordinating with the participant's regular health care providers and directing the investigation of any adverse occurrences should be clearly identified[11].

Students' perspectives on employing real patients in medical student entrance exams vary widely. At every step of the process of planning an evaluation wherein patients are to be included, significant ethical and legal considerations arise. The benefits of employing actual patients have been repeatedly demonstrated. Patients, however, must serve as a means to a goal in the form of better education. Those who work in medical training have a responsibility to the patients who provide their time to participate in process[12]. Topics that should be addressed in regional standards.

**Information for patients before to the day:** Permission (knowing, voluntary, by a competent patient, and continuing)
**Fair compensation:** Medical records accessibility and availability
**During the time:**
Implications of legal and ethical responsibilities to respond to emergencies
Equipment for handling patient deterioration or medical crises is readily available.
Ability to hire personnel trained on available machinery
Care coordination for people in need of medical assistance
Maintaining patient privacy and confidentiality
**The end of the day:**
Discussion of unanticipated or negative outcomes
Regular healthcare providers are kept in the loop
Data archiving and deletion

Thus, the patients in all levels of medical study (undergrad, graduate, and post-graduate) have certain tasks. Local standards that address the most salient ethical and legal concerns should be considered by all medical institutions that incorporate patient participation in medical education.

## REFERENCES

1. Collins JP, Harden RM. AMEE medical education guide No 13: real patients, simulated patients and simulators in clinical examinations. Med Teach.1998;20:508-21
2. Coletta EM, Murphy JB. Using elderly and disabled patients to teach history taking and physical examination. Acad Med.1993;68:901-2
3. Newble DI. The observed long-case in clinical assessment. Med Educ.1991;25:369-73.
4. Stacy R, Spencer J. Patients as teachers: a qualitative study of patients' views on their role in a community based undergraduate project. Med Educ.1999;33:688-94.
5. Welfare MR, Price CI, Han SW, Barton JR. Experiences of volunteer patients during undergraduate examinations: printed information can lead to greater satisfaction. Med Educ.1999;33:165-69
6. Schrempft S, Piumatti G, Gerbase MW, Baroffio A. Pathways to performance in undergraduate medical students: role of conscientiousness and the perceived educational environment. Adv Health SciEduc Theory Pract.2021;26(5):1537-54.
7. Mobhammer D, Graf J, Joos S, Hertkorn R. Physical examination in undergraduate medical education in the field of general practice - a scoping review. BMC Med Educ.2017;17(1):230.
8. Duan L, Mukherjee EM, Federman DG. The physical examination: a survey of patient preferences and expectations during primary care visits. Postgrad Med.2020;132(1):102-8.
9. Austin Z, Gregory P, Tabak D. Simulated patients vs. standardized patients in objective structured clinical examinations. Am J Pharm Educ.2006;70(5):119.
10. Taylor S, Haywood M, Shulruf B. Comparison of effect between simulated patient clinical skill training and student role play on objective structured clinical examination performance outcomes for medical students in Australia. J EducEval Health Prof.2019;16:3.
11. Bokken L, Rethans JJ, van Heurn L, Duvivier R, Scherpbier A, van der Vleuten C. Students' views on the use of real patients and simulated patients in undergraduate medical education. Acad Med.2009;84(7):958-63.
12. Das V, Daniels B, Kwan A, Saria V, Das R, Pai M, Das J. Simulated patients and their reality: An inquiry into theory and method. SocSci Med.2022;300:114571