

1 PATIENT SAFETY EDUCATION IN UNDERGRADUATE MEDICAL CURRICULA: 2 A CONCEPT ANALYSIS AND SCOPING REVIEW PROTOCOL

3 4 AUTHORS

5
6 Jonathan Bowman-Newmark, MB ChB, BDS (jonathan.bowman-newmark@abdn.ac.uk) ¹

7 Evangeline Brock, PhD (evangeline.brock@abdn.ac.uk) ^{1,2}

8 Helen Vosper, PhD (helen.vosper@abdn.ac.uk) ^{1,2,*}

9
10 ¹ Institute of Education in Healthcare and Medical Sciences, University of Aberdeen, UK

11 ² Centre for Healthcare Education Research and Innovation, University of Aberdeen, UK

12
13 * Corresponding author

14 15 ORCID ID

16
17 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8322-3223> (Jonathan Bowman-Newmark)

18 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4606-6972> (Evangeline Brock)

19 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7796-5183> (Helen Vosper)

20 21 ABSTRACT

22 23 Objective

24
25 This study aims to establish how the phenomenon of patient safety education
26 manifests within undergraduate medical curricula. The specific objectives are to
27 conduct a concept analysis, in order to make explicit the concept of patient safety
28 education and inform its operational definition. Thereafter, to conduct a scoping review,
29 in order to systematically map what educational content is taught, who is taught that
30 content, and how that content is taught.

31 32 Introduction

33
34 Preliminary searches identified four extant systematic reviews, published between
35 NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.
2010 and 2022, which investigated different aspects of how patient safety education

36 manifested within undergraduate medical curricula. Notwithstanding, those findings do
37 not provide a sufficiently robust basis to inform contemporaneous discourse.

38

39 **Eligibility criteria**

40

41 The participants, concept, and context framework will be used to determine the
42 evidence sources eligible for inclusion in the scoping review. Eligible participants will
43 include learners matriculated on undergraduate medical programmes, and the
44 educators that teach learners on those programmes. The concept will be patient safety
45 education, according to an operational definition that will be established. Eligible
46 contexts will include the taught curricula of undergraduate programmes in medicine.

47

48 **Methods**

49

50 An exploratory and descriptive study that will sequentially implement the Walker and
51 Avant framework for concept analysis and the updated JBI methodology for scoping
52 reviews. Eight electronic databases and one internet search engine will be utilised to
53 identify sources published between 1 May 2014 and 30 November 2024. Pre-defined
54 eligibility criteria will be used to select sources. Data will be extracted and analysed,
55 and findings will be presented.

56

57 **KEYWORDS**

58

59 Evidence synthesis; medical education; medical student; patient safety; scoping review

60

61 **ACRONYMS**

62

63 PRESS, peer review of electronic search strategies; PRISMA, preferred reporting
64 items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses; PRISMA-ScR, preferred reporting
65 items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses extension for scoping reviews

66

67 **INTRODUCTION**

68

69 Patient safety has been averred as “one of the most ancient and fundamental
70 principles of medicine” (World Health Organization, 2024, p. vii); nonetheless, it still

71 remains the case that many patients experience iatrogenic harm in healthcare
72 settings. In an enduring paradox, safety tends to be signalled by its absence more
73 than its presence (Reason, 2000; Ricciardi and Cascini, 2021). Plaintively, 6% of
74 patients worldwide were estimated to have experienced an episode of preventable
75 harm between 2000 and 2019 (Panagioti et al., 2019). Internationally, organisations
76 including the General Medical Council and Medical Schools Council (2015)—
77 respectively, the professional regulator for medical practitioners and the representative
78 body for medical schools in the United Kingdom—the Association of American Medical
79 Colleges (2024)—representative of accredited medical schools in North America—and
80 the Government of India (2018) have all emphasised the importance of education as
81 an intervention to reduce the future burden of harm. The importance of undergraduate
82 patient safety education has been disputed though. Pedersen (2018) contended that
83 “safety dispositions are not something that can be learnt and trained in the classroom”
84 (p. 236), whilst conceding that “it is not unlikely that the seeds for the development of a
85 pragmatic attitude can be planted in the classroom if the curriculum allows” (p. 236).
86 Although it may be that “education alone is not the... answer” (Cosby, 2009, p. 282),
87 patient safety education has been maintained as important in realising change
88 (Al-Worafi, 2024), and ElAraby, Ra’oof and Alkhadragy (2018) even endorsed it as the
89 “main solution to this problem” (p. 91).


90
91 Integration of patient safety education within healthcare professionals’ curricula has
92 now been advocated for over two decades (Kohn, Corrigan and Donaldson, 2000;
93 Association of American Medical Colleges, 2001; Institute of Medicine, 2001; Patient
94 Safety Education Study Group, 2009; Lucian Leape Institute at the National Patient
95 Safety Foundation, 2010). Indeed, international consensus exists that contemporary
96 undergraduate medical curricula should include patient safety education (World Health
97 Organization, 2009; 2011; 2021). Different educational strategies and modalities can
98 be employed by educators to deliver patient safety education (Gilula and Barach,
99 2009), with teaching formats themselves being considered influential in facilitating
100 effective learning (Maeda, Kamishiraki and Starkey, 2012). Moreover, making content
101 representative of patient safety education ‘visible’ to learners has been judged
102 particularly valuable (Abbott et al., 2020). Vincent and Amalberti (2016) emphasised
103 how “labelling an issue as a safety issue is... strongly motivational” (p. 5), which
104 reinforces Howe’s (2006) longstanding recommendation that at least “some part of a
105 formal curriculum is explicitly focused on patient safety” (p. 188).

106 Preliminary searches, performed during October 2024, identified four systematic
107 reviews that investigated different aspects of how patient safety education manifested
108 within undergraduate medical curricula (Wong et al., 2010; Nie et al., 2011; Kirkman et
109 al., 2015; Anugrahsari et al., 2022). Significantly, Nie et al. (2011) identified only a
110 single previously-published report that described patient safety education within a core
111 undergraduate medical curriculum. In turn, that report (Patey et al., 2007), described a
112 literature review which did not identify any previous instances. Thus, it may be inferred
113 that patient safety education—as a concept discussed in the literature in relation to
114 undergraduate medical curricula—emerged only relatively recently. In 2009, Sandars
115 posed the questions: ‘what’ content should be learned, and ‘how’ should that content
116 be taught? The same year, the World Health Organization provoked consideration of
117 ‘when’ patient safety education should be taught in their publication the ‘WHO Patient
118 Safety Curriculum Guide for Medical Schools’. Kirkman and colleagues’ (2015)
119 systematic review, which updated the earliest of the four systematic reviews of patient
120 safety education (Wong et al., 2010), provided robust and contemporaneous insights.
121 Nevertheless, its findings were derived from searches that are now more than a
122 decade old. Patient safety advocates have more recently highlighted the “massive
123 efforts underway to strengthen patient safety education in medical schools” (Watson,
124 2017, p. 12), which Pedersen (2018) concurred was “increasingly becoming an
125 obligatory part of the curriculum in medical schools worldwide” (p. 233). Moreover,
126 Leape (2021), who echoed Gandhi et al. (2018), intimated that undergraduate medical
127 “curricula have increasingly included patient safety and safety science” (p. 376).
128 Notwithstanding the methodological limitations of the most contemporaneous
129 systematic review available (Anugrahsari et al., 2022), those perspectives would
130 appear substantiated. However, weaknesses in respect of that study’s conduct and
131 reporting constrain its relative contribution, and in isolation the study does not provide
132 a sufficiently robust basis to inform contemporaneous discourse. Forward citation
133 searches, performed during October 2024, of the known systematic reviews did not
134 identify more recent systematic studies that updated their findings. This suggests that
135 an evidence synthesis to address a widening gap in the literature would now be timely.
136
137 It was conspicuous, across the preliminary literature reviewed, that patient safety
138 education was conceptualised inconsistently through use of various terminologies.
139 This may lead to a potential conflation of two closely-related but distinct concepts:
140 safety and quality. Although safety scientists have predicated safety in terms of quality

141 (Hollnagel, 2014; Hollnagel, Wears and Braithwaite, 2015), different perspectives have
142 been contended as to “whether one is a subset of the other and, if so, which [is]
143 superordinate” (Wears and Sutcliffe, 2019, p. 42). Vincent (2010) intimated that many
144 are content to simply describe their relationship “as a continuum” (p. 37). Perhaps in
145 an implicit appreciation of that, Wong et al. (2010) and Kirkman et al. (2015) opted to
146 examine patient safety and quality improvement education concurrently. Weingart’s
147 (2005) critique that “the terminology of safety is perplexing on a good day, and near
148 impossible on a bad one” (p. 93) seems pertinent here. Although “the perimeter of
149 safety” has expanded (Vincent and Amalberti, 2015, p. 539), it has long been
150 acknowledged that the dimensions of safety and quality “are not synonymous” (Cooper
151 et al., 2000, p. 3). Accordingly, it seems important for any future research to
152 unambiguously delineate the meaning of patient safety education, in order that
153 ensuing findings are specific to the concept of interest.

154
155 Concept analysis is a rigorous method of examining a concept and its use in order to
156 ascertain its attributes (Delves-Yates, Stockl and Moore, 2018). Significantly, concept
157 analysis has been considered particularly suited to analysing emerging concepts that
158 arise from practice (Yazdani and Shokooh, 2018). Walker and Avant’s (1983; 2019)
159 linguistic framework has been recognised as the predominant approach to concept
160 analysis used by researchers (Rodgers, Jacelon and Knaf, 2018). Furthermore, it has
161 been deemed the “most comprehensive and systematic method” (Chabeli, Nolte and
162 Ndawo, 2021, p. 13). A schematic representation of this framework is shown (Figure 1).

Figure 1 Schematic representation of the concept analysis framework
(adapted from Walker and Avant, 2019, p. 180)



163 Walker and Avant (2019) acknowledged this framework’s utility in analysing a concept
164 “objectively as subject matter, rather than subjectively as a persuasive weapon”
165 (p. 183), which may bound out known tendencies to ‘moralise’ when a concept has
166 value implications. It is expected this may be propitious when examining the concept
167 of patient safety education, given its implicit and explicit meanings. Although criticism
168 has been offered that concept analysis can be over-reductionist with respect to
169 complex concepts (Weaver and Mitcham, 2008), it is proposed here that an
170 operational definition of patient safety education—informed through concept
171 analysis—will afford opportunities to facilitate more robust evidence synthesis
172 processes. Explicitly defining the concept of interest is expected to positively impact on
173 subsequent source selection, and data extraction and analysis. Preliminary searches,
174 performed during September 2024, did not identify a previously-published concept
175 analysis of patient safety education. Undertaking this now, in order to inform a
176 properly-situated understanding (Toulmin, 1972; Bergdahl and Berterö, 2016), is
177 proposed as a means to objectively operationalise its definition (Waltz, Strickland and
178 Lenz, 2017; Grove and Gray, 2023). That approach remains entirely consonant with
179 the perspective that concept analysis “should be a bridge to further related work”
180 (Walker and Avant, 2019, p. 181), and partially rebuts Draper’s (2014) criticism that
181 concept analysis makes an insubstantial contribution to scholarship.

182
183 In 2015, Wong offered a prospective research agenda that outlined specific patient
184 safety education research needed as this related to medical curricula. Despite Zhou
185 and colleagues’ (2024) demonstration of growing trends in patient safety education
186 research over recent years, Wong’s agenda still remains apposite today. Moreover, it
187 remains undisputed that “medical curricula must be challenged and changed to
188 educate the clinicians that we need in the future” (Lachman, 2021, p. 48); as a
189 consequence, robust evidence is continually needed to inform that change. Accordingly,
190 a systematic evidence synthesis aimed at understanding how the phenomenon of
191 patient safety education manifests within undergraduate medical curricula would
192 satisfy both the expressed and perceived needs of knowledge users (Pollock et al.,
193 2022). However, it is proposed here that such an evidence synthesis should not seek
194 only to update the existing systematic reviews. In common with expectations arising
195 from other relatively-novel concepts of interest, it is anticipated that the concept of
196 patient safety education has evolved as knowledge has been accrued (Perneger,
197 2006; Chinn, Kramer and Sitzman, 2022). Instead, a broader exploratory research

198 question is proposed that would more optimally be addressed through a scoping
199 review (Munn et al., 2018; 2023; Peters et al., 2021; Pollock et al., 2024). Utilisation of
200 a scoping review design in these circumstances is supported by the Knowledge
201 Translation Program's 'Right Review' decision support tool (Amog et al., 2022; Clyne
202 et al., 2024). Preliminary searches of the Open Science Framework registries and
203 International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews, performed during October
204 2024, did not identify any similar study that was ongoing or recently completed.

205

206 Therefore, this study aims to establish how the phenomenon of patient safety education
207 manifests within undergraduate medical curricula. The specific objectives are:

- 208 1. to conduct a concept analysis, in order to make explicit the concept of patient
209 safety education and inform its operational definition; thereafter,
- 210 2. to conduct a scoping review, in order to systematically map what educational
211 content is taught, who is taught that content, and how that content is taught.

212

213 **REVIEW QUESTIONS**

214

215 This study aims to answer the primary review question: how does the phenomenon of
216 patient safety education manifest within undergraduate medical curricula? That
217 question will be addressed by synthesising answers to three sub-questions that seek
218 to explore the concept with respect to the study's participants and context:

- 219 1. what content representative of patient safety education is included within
220 undergraduate medical curricula?
- 221 2. which undergraduate medical student cohorts are the learners of that content?
- 222 3. which pedagogic approaches are used by educators to deliver that content?

223

224 **ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA**

225

226 The participants, concept, and context framework will be used to determine the
227 evidence sources eligible for inclusion in the scoping review.

228

229 **Participants**

230

231 Eligible participants will include learners matriculated on undergraduate educational
232 programmes in medicine, and the educators that teach learners on those programmes.

233 **Concept**

234
235 The concept of interest will be patient safety education, expressed and understood
236 according to an operational definition that will be established.

237
238 **Context**

239
240 Eligible contexts will include the taught curricula of undergraduate programmes in
241 medicine. Taught curricula comprise “the content that is delivered through educational
242 activities for the students to learn from” (Chakrabarti et al., 2021, p. 2) and reifies that
243 which occurs in practice (Wu, 2022; Seifouri, 2023). Any interprofessional educational
244 contexts, where these are reported, must identifiably include eligible participants.
245 There will be no restrictions imposed with respect to geographical location.

246
247 **Types of evidence sources**

248
249 The scoping review will consider undifferentiated, published or unpublished,
250 peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed primary research of any quantitative, qualitative,
251 or mixed-methods methodology. Anticipated study designs include, but will not be
252 limited to, experimental, quasi-experimental, analytical and descriptive observational,
253 ethnographic, and qualitative description. Evidence syntheses, including systematic
254 reviews and scoping reviews, will also be considered. Sources with titles and abstracts
255 not published in English, and / or retracted post-publication, will be excluded.

256
257 **METHODS**

258
259 This exploratory and descriptive study will implement concept analysis and scoping
260 review methods sequentially, in a manner analogous to the novel methodology
261 described by Kang, Kim and Cho (2023).

262
263 **Concept analysis**

264
265 A concept analysis of patient safety education will be conducted according to the
266 eight-step framework described by Walker and Avant (1983; 2019), which itself
267 represents a modified version of Wilson’s (1963) classical analysis procedure:

- 268 1. select the concept (viz. patient safety education);
- 269 2. determine the aims of analysis (i.e., to inform an operational definition);
- 270 3. identify uses of the concept;
- 271 4. determine its defining attributes;
- 272 5. identify a model case (i.e., a paradigmatic exemplar);
- 273 6. identify additional cases (e.g., borderline, related, and contrary cases);
- 274 7. identify antecedents and consequences; and
- 275 8. determine empirical referents (i.e., tangible and measurable phenomena).

276

277 As illustrated in Figure 1, Walker and Avant’s framework necessitates iterative
278 processes (Yazdani and Bayazidi, 2020). Despite each step being numbered
279 sequentially, movement between steps is expected.

280

281 **Scoping review**

282

283 The scoping review will be conducted in accordance with the updated JBI methodology
284 (Peters et al., 2020a; 2020b), which itself is based on Arksey and O’Malley’s (2005)
285 foundational framework as enhanced by Levac, Colquhoun and O’Brien (2010). The
286 study will be reported in accordance with the preferred reporting items for systematic
287 reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR)
288 (Tricco et al., 2018), with the proviso that this guidance is currently being updated
289 (Tricco et al., 2024). A completed PRISMA-ScR checklist will be made available as an
290 appendix to the final report. This a priori protocol was developed in accordance with
291 best practice guidance and the reporting items for scoping review protocols (Peters et
292 al., 2022). The proposed study was prospectively registered with the Open Science
293 Framework (<https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/Z9VQ7>).

294

295 *Search strategy*

296

297 The search strategy is intended to systematically and comprehensively identify
298 potentially-relevant sources, within the constraints of available resources and time.
299 Electronic bibliographic databases and an internet search engine will be utilised. In
300 order to identify sources available following Kirkman and colleagues’ (2015)
301 systematic review, searches will target sources published between 1 May 2014
302 and 30 November 2024, inclusive.

303 Firstly, in order to identify potentially-relevant seed sources, initial searches of
304 MEDLINE (Ovid) and Embase (Ovid) databases will be performed using search
305 facets based on a logic grid aligned to the eligibility criteria. This is summarised as
306 a draft search strategy (Appendix A). Secondly, text words contained in the titles
307 and / or abstracts of potentially-relevant seed sources, and the controlled
308 vocabulary used to index those sources, will be used to develop a primary search
309 strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid). Guidance will be sought from an information
310 specialist to optimise the specificity of the search, in order to manage the volume
311 of citations whilst realising a desire for sensitivity (Peters et al., 2020b; Alexander
312 et al., 2024). In order to quality assure its integrity the search strategy will be peer
313 reviewed by an information specialist not otherwise associated with this study, in
314 line with the peer review of electronic search strategies (PRESS) guideline
315 (McGowan et al., 2016). The peer-reviewed primary search strategy will be made
316 available as an appendix to the final report. To negotiate expected variability in
317 indexing between bibliographic databases, and to limit the impact of publication
318 biases, the primary search strategy will then be adapted for five additional
319 biomedical or interdisciplinary electronic databases: Embase (Ovid), CINAHL
320 (EBSCO), Cochrane Library, PsycInfo (Ovid), and Web of Science (Clarivate). As
321 recommended by Lam et al. (2024), ERIC—an education-specific electronic
322 database—will also be searched using EBSCO. Wherever possible, translation of
323 the primary search strategy’s search strings will be technology augmented in order
324 to better align this technical task with recognised human capacities and
325 capabilities (O’Connor et al., 2019; Khalil et al., 2024). Polyglot Search Translator
326 will be used, which is validated for this purpose (Clark et al., 2020). In order to
327 constructively address a potential lack of inclusivity resulting from publication
328 biases, grey literature will be searched using Dissertations & Theses and A&I
329 (ProQuest) and one internet search engine (Google; first five pages of search hits)
330 (Pearson et al., 2024). Thus, any consequent exclusion of potentially-relevant
331 sources can be acknowledged and rationalised (Peters et al., 2022). In order to
332 ensure any retractions are identified, searches will seek to capture post-publication
333 amendments (Lefebvre et al., 2024). Thirdly, the reference lists of included
334 sources will be hand searched for additional potentially-relevant sources.

335
336 All identified citations will be collated using reference management software
337 (RefWorks; ProQuest, Ann Arbor (MI), United States of America). Citations will

338 then be de-duplicated using Systematic Review Accelerator Deduplicator (Forbes
339 et al. 2024), which has demonstrated superior accuracy and sensitivity for
340 automated de-duplication (McKeown and Mir, 2024). If sources are found to be
341 replicated then the most up-to-date version of the source will be preferred.

342

343 *Source of evidence selection*

344

345 Eligibility criteria will be used to select sources according to a two-stage process,
346 which will involve the screening of titles and abstracts followed by the screening of
347 full texts. Following collaborative development of an elaboration document,
348 intended to support objective source selection, two human reviewers (JB-N and
349 HV) will independently conduct screening processes in duplicate using Rayyan
350 (Cambridge (MA), United States of America). Any disagreements that arise with
351 respect to eligibility will be resolved through discussion. Should consensus not be
352 reached then disagreements will be arbitrated by a third human reviewer (EB).

353

354 Although not yet ascertained empirically, it has been suggested that the corpus of
355 literature that may require to be screened could be extensive on account of the
356 continued emergence of the concept of interest (Wong, 2015; Zhou et al., 2024).
357 Should the volume of potentially-relevant sources prove too extensive to be
358 practicable following title and abstract screening, decisions about restricting the
359 number of full text sources screened will prioritise state-of-the-art (Alexander et al.,
360 2024). In order to answer the same review questions, albeit for a narrower, more
361 contemporaneous time interval, newer evidence sources will be preferred.

362

363 Following the screening of titles and abstracts, potentially-relevant sources whose
364 full text is presented in a language other than English will be excluded. Resource
365 constraints preclude their professional translation. No-cost neural translation will
366 not be performed due to an inability to confirm the interpretation of a nuanced
367 concept of interest, which is expected to be determined in part by “cultural,
368 contextual, and societal differences” (Kim et al., 2015). However, in order to
369 manage potential reporting biases, the number of citations involved will be
370 reported alongside other sources not included following full text screening. A list of
371 the citations involved will also be made available as an appendix to the final report.
372 Sources that appear to satisfy eligibility criteria, or where uncertainty still remains,

373 will be retrieved using institutional access policies or requested as inter-library
374 loans. Where a source cannot be obtained via those means, the source's
375 corresponding author will be contacted by e-mail—maximum of two attempts—to
376 seek the source prior to its exclusion. To facilitate the screening of full texts, all
377 retrieved full texts will be imported to Rayyan. Where uncertainty remains about a
378 source's eligibility following full text screening, the source's corresponding author
379 will be contacted by e-mail—maximum of two attempts—in an attempt to resolve
380 question(s) prior to its exclusion. Identical processes will be followed for any
381 potentially-relevant sources identified from the reference lists of included sources.

382
383 A preliminary pilot screening exercise will be conducted prior to the screening of
384 titles and abstracts, which will involve the intended reviewers examining a
385 proportion of randomly selected sources. This will occur again prior to the screening
386 of full texts. The reviewers' inter-rater agreement will be calculated and will require
387 to be $\geq 75\%$ before each stage, in accordance with available best practice guidance
388 for scoping review conduct (Peters et al., 2020b). If the target is not achieved
389 initially, the reviewers will discuss their reasons for agreement and disagreement;
390 reviewers will undertake repeated cycles of piloting and collaborative modification
391 of the source selection elaboration document until the target is achieved.

392
393 The number of sources identified, duplicates removed, sources screened, and
394 sources excluded following full text screening, alongside the reasons for exclusion,
395 will be reported narratively and as a PRISMA flow diagram (Page et al., 2021).

396

397 *Data extraction*

398

399 A standardised electronic data extraction instrument will be developed as a
400 workbook in Microsoft Excel for Mac version 16.78 (Redmond (WA), United States
401 of America), based on a draft data extraction instrument (Appendix B). The data
402 items extracted will be guided by the review sub-questions and variables that have
403 been reported previously (Wong et al., 2010; Nie et al., 2011; Kirkman et al.,
404 2015). A data extraction elaboration worksheet will be developed to promote
405 consistency during data extraction. The variables extracted are expected to evolve
406 as data extraction progresses; as such, this worksheet will become a 'living'
407 document. In order to ensure that data is reliably captured, a preliminary pilot data

408 extraction exercise will be conducted by the intended data extractor (JB-N) using a
409 selection of different source types. Any missing, redundant, or unclear variables
410 will be added, removed, or revised. Where additional data is required, a source's
411 corresponding author will be contacted by e-mail—maximum of two attempts—on
412 a case-by-case basis. Due to resource constraints, data extraction will be
413 undertaken by a single data extractor only. The final data extraction instrument will
414 be made available as an appendix to the final report.

415
416 A planned simplification is proposed with respect to the extraction of content
417 representative of patient safety education. The World Health Organization's (2011)
418 patient safety topics (pp. 18–19)—incorporating themes predicated on an existing
419 evidence-based education framework (Australian Council for Safety and Quality in
420 Health Care, 2005; Walton et al., 2006)—will be utilised to guide categorisation. In
421 order to promote increased consistency during data extraction, the data extraction
422 instrument will incorporate a closed-ended 11-item pre-populated matrix intended
423 to operationalise structured data collection as a preliminary stage of data cleaning.

424
425 Following its extraction, the raw data will be cleaned by the data extractor. In order
426 to manage potential ascertainment biases, a proportion of the data will be checked
427 by one verifier (HV) for accuracy and completeness (Robson et al., 2019). Any
428 disagreements that arise about the data extracted will be resolved through
429 discussion. Should consensus not be reached then disagreements will be
430 arbitrated by a third party (EB). Data extraction processes undertaken for other
431 systematic forms of evidence synthesis have been reported not to be significantly
432 affected by a data extractor's level of experience (Jones et al., 2005; Horton et al.,
433 2010). Accordingly, pragmatic decision making about the utilisation of resources
434 during this study will prioritise multiple researchers' involvement in screening
435 processes, in order to mitigate against a possibly greater risk that
436 potentially-relevant resources may be excluded inappropriately following
437 single-reviewer screening (Waffenschmidt et al., 2019; Gartlehner et al., 2020).

438
439 *Data analysis and presentation*

440
441 Contextualised descriptive analyses will synthesise how the phenomenon of
442 patient safety education manifests within undergraduate medical curricula. On

443 account of the anticipated heterogeneity of sources, the review sub-questions
444 themselves will comprise the principal units of analysis. No formal appraisal of
445 methodological quality or risk of bias will be undertaken, and evidence synthesis
446 will focus on high-level categorisation. Those approaches remain entirely
447 consonant with available best practice guidance for scoping review conduct
448 (Peters et al., 2020a; 2020b; Pollock et al., 2023).

449
450 Characteristics of included sources and review findings will be presented in
451 narrative, tabular, and / or visual formats appropriate for scholarly discourse
452 (Nyanchoka et al., 2019). Their rendering will be progressively refined to maximise
453 clarity of presentation, and will proactively anticipate how to engage knowledge
454 users (Khalil et al., 2021; Pollock et al., 2023). Potential visual formats, which may
455 be created using either proprietary or open-source software, may include: a word
456 cloud, to aggregate the content included within undergraduate medical curricula
457 representative of patient safety education; a waffle chart, to differentiate
458 undergraduate medical student cohorts as the learners of that content; and / or
459 iconography, to illustrate pedagogic approaches used to deliver that content.

460

461 **DISSEMINATION**

462

463 The findings of this study will be submitted for publication in a high-impact,
464 discipline-specific peer-reviewed scholarly journal. It is anticipated that those findings
465 will be likely to impact at an academic level; consequently, findings may also be
466 disseminated through academic conference presentations. To promote engagement
467 with prospective knowledge users, a short video abstract will also be produced.

468

469 **DEVIATIONS FROM PROTOCOL**

470

471 On account of the iterative processes proposed—particularly execution of the search
472 strategy, data extraction, and data analysis and presentation—deviations from this
473 protocol may be required. Significant deviations will be tracked using a worksheet in
474 Microsoft Excel for Mac version 16.78 (Redmond (WA), United States of America), and
475 these will be reported and explained in the methods of the final report. That approach
476 remains congruent with available best practice guidance for reporting deviations from
477 a scoping review protocol (Peters et al., 2022).

478 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

479

480 The authors wish to thank Mel Bickerton (Information Consultant and Site Services
481 Manager, Medical Library, University of Aberdeen) who provided guidance in the
482 development of the draft search strategy.

483

484 **ETHICS**

485

486 Ethical approval is not required for this study, which is a concept analysis and scoping
487 review of previously-published data otherwise available in the public domain.

488

489 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

490

491 The authors declare no known potential or actual conflicts of interest that could
492 inappropriately influence, or be perceived to influence, the research, authorship,
493 and / or publication of this study.

494

495 **FUNDING**

496

497 This study did not receive a specific grant from funding agencies in the public,
498 commercial, and / or not-for-profit sectors.

499

500 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

501

502 Data sharing is not applicable to this protocol as no new data were created or analysed.

503

504 **CRedit AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

505

506 Conceptualisation: JB-N and HV; data curation: JB-N; investigation: JB-N, EB and HV;
507 methodology: JB-N, EB and HV; project administration: JB-N; resources: JB-N;
508 supervision: EB and HV; visualisation: JB-N; writing—original draft: JB-N;
509 writing—review and editing: JB-N, EB and HV. JB-N is the guarantor of this protocol.

510 REFERENCES

511

512 Abbott, J.F. et al. (2020) 'To the point: integrating patient safety education into the
513 obstetrics and gynaecology undergraduate curriculum', *Journal of Patient Safety*,
514 16(1), pp. e39–e45. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1097/pts.0000000000000250>

515

516 Al-Worafi, Y. (2024) *Patient safety in developing countries: education, research, case*
517 *studies*. London: CRC Press.

518

519 Alexander, L. et al. (2024) 'Large scoping reviews: managing volume and potential
520 chaos in a pool of evidence sources', *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 170, 111343,
521 pp. 1–7. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2024.111343>

522

523 Amog, K. et al. (2022) 'The web-based "Right Review" tool asks reviewers simple
524 questions to suggest methods from 41 knowledge synthesis methods', *Journal of*
525 *Clinical Epidemiology*, 147, pp. 42–51. Available at:
526 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2022.03.004>

527

528 Anugrahsari, S. et al. (2022) 'Patient safety education for clinical students: a
529 systematic literature review', *Open Access Macedonian Journal of Medicine Sciences*,
530 10(F), pp. 208–214. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2022.8345>

531

532 Arksey, H. and O'Malley, L. (2005) 'Scoping studies: towards a methodological
533 framework', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), pp. 19–32.
534 Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>

535

536 Association of American Medical Colleges (2001) *Contemporary issues in medicine:*
537 *quality of care: medical school objectives project*. Washington (DC): Association of
538 American Medical Colleges.

539

540 Association of American Medical Colleges (2024) *Quality improvement and patient*
541 *safety competencies across the learning continuum*. Version 2. Available at:
542 <https://www.aamc.org/data-reports/report/qipscompetencies> (Accessed: 15 November
543 2024).

- 544 Australian Council for Safety and Quality in Health Care (2005) *National patient safety*
545 *education framework*. Available at: [https://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/publications-](https://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/publications-and-resources/resource-library/national-patient-safety-education-framework)
546 [and-resources/resource-library/national-patient-safety-education-framework](https://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/publications-and-resources/resource-library/national-patient-safety-education-framework)
547 (Accessed: 29 September 2024).
- 548
- 549 Bergdahl, E. and Berterö, C.M. (2016) 'Concept analysis and the building blocks of
550 theory: misconceptions regarding theory development', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*,
551 72(10), pp. 2558–2566. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13002>
- 552
- 553 Chabeli, M., Nolte, A. and Ndawo, G. (2021) 'Authentic learning: a concept analysis',
554 *Global Journal of Health Science*, 13(4), pp. 12–23. Available at:
555 <https://doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v13n4p12>
- 556
- 557 Chakrabarti, R. et al. (2021) 'Approaching an undergraduate medical curriculum map:
558 challenges and expectations', *BMC Medical Education*, 21(1), 341, pp. 1–12. Available
559 at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-021-02778-6>
- 560
- 561 Chinn, P.L., Kramer, M.K. and Sitzman, K. (2022) *Knowledge development in nursing*.
562 11th ed. St Louis (MO): Elsevier.
- 563
- 564 Clark, J.M. et al. (2020) 'Improving the translation of search strategies using the
565 Polyglot search translator: a randomized controlled trial', *Journal of the Medical Library*
566 *Association*, 108(2), pp. 195–207. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2020.834>
- 567
- 568 Clyne, B. et al. (2024) 'An international modified Delphi process supported updating
569 the web-based "Right Review" tool', *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 170, 111333,
570 pp. 1–13. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2024.111333>
- 571
- 572 Cooper, J.B. et al. (2000) 'The National Patient Safety Foundation agenda for research
573 and development in patient safety', *Medscape General Medicine*, 2(3), E38, pp. 1–12.
- 574
- 575 Cosby, K.S. (2009) 'Patient safety curriculum', in Croskerry, P. et al. (eds) *Patient*
576 *safety in emergency medicine*. London: Wolters Kluwer Health / Lippincott Williams
577 and Wilkins, pp. 281–287.

- 578 Delves-Yates, C., Stockl, A. and Moore, J. (2018) 'Making sense of concept analysis',
579 *Nurse Researcher*, 25(4), pp. 43–46. Available at:
580 <https://doi.org/10.7748/nr.2018.e1503>
581
- 582 Draper, P. (2014) 'A critique of concept analysis', *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 70(6),
583 pp. 1207–1208. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12280>
584
- 585 ElAraby, S., Ra'oof, R.A. and Alkhadragy, R. (2018) 'Learning of patient safety in
586 health professions education', in Stawicki, S.P. and Firstenberg, M.S. (eds) *Vignettes*
587 *in patient safety: volume 3*. London: IntechOpen, pp. 89–106.
588
- 589 Forbes, C. et al. (2024) 'Automation of duplicate record detection for systematic
590 reviews: Deduplicator', *Systematic Reviews*, 13(1), 206, pp. 1–13. Available at:
591 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-024-02619-9>
592
- 593 Gandhi, T.K. et al. (2018) 'Transforming concepts in patient safety: a progress report',
594 *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 27(12), pp. 1019–1026. Available at:
595 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2017-007756>
596
- 597 Gartlehner, G. et al. (2020) 'Single-reviewer abstract screening missed 13 percent of
598 relevant studies: a crowd-based, randomized controlled trial', *Journal of Clinical*
599 *Epidemiology*, 121, pp. 20–28. Available at:
600 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2020.01.005>
601
- 602 General Medical Council and Medical Schools Council (2015) *First, do no harm:*
603 *enhancing patient safety teaching in undergraduate medical education*. Available at:
604 [https://www.gmc-uk.org/education/standards-guidance-and-curricula/position-](https://www.gmc-uk.org/education/standards-guidance-and-curricula/position-statements/first-do-no-harm---enhancing-patient-safety-teaching-in-undergraduate-medical-education)
605 [statements/first-do-no-harm---enhancing-patient-safety-teaching-in-undergraduate-](https://www.gmc-uk.org/education/standards-guidance-and-curricula/position-statements/first-do-no-harm---enhancing-patient-safety-teaching-in-undergraduate-medical-education)
606 [medical-education](https://www.gmc-uk.org/education/standards-guidance-and-curricula/position-statements/first-do-no-harm---enhancing-patient-safety-teaching-in-undergraduate-medical-education) (Accessed: 29 September 2024).
607
- 608 Gilula, M.F. and Barach, P.R. (2009) 'Patient safety education and curriculum design',
609 in Hurwitz, B. and Sheikh, A. (eds) *Health care errors and patient safety*. Chichester:
610 Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 238–253.

- 611 Government of India (2018) *National patient safety implementation framework*
612 2018–2025. Available at: [https://nhsrindia.org/national-patient-safety-implementation-](https://nhsrindia.org/national-patient-safety-implementation-framework-2018-2025)
613 [framework-2018-2025](https://nhsrindia.org/national-patient-safety-implementation-framework-2018-2025) (Accessed: 15 November 2024).
614
- 615 Grove, S.K. and Gray, J.R. (2023) *Understanding nursing research: building an*
616 *evidence-based practice*. 8th ed. St Louis (MO): Elsevier.
617
- 618 Hollnagel, E. (2014) *Safety-I and safety-II: the past and future of safety management*.
619 London: CRC Press.
620
- 621 Hollnagel, E., Wears, R.L. and Braithwaite, J. (2015) *From safety-I to safety-II: a white*
622 *paper*. Available at: <https://psnet.ahrq.gov/issue/safety-i-safety-ii-white-paper>
623 (Accessed: 5 November 2024).
624
- 625 Horton, J. et al. (2010) 'Systematic review data extraction: cross-sectional study
626 showed that experience did not increase accuracy', *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*,
627 63(3), pp. 289–298. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.04.007>
628
- 629 Howe, A. (2006) 'Patient safety: education, training and professional development', in
630 Walshe, K. and Boaden, R. (eds) *Patient safety: research into practice*. Maidenhead:
631 Open University Press, pp. 187–197.
632
- 633 Institute of Medicine (2001) *Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the*
634 *21st century*. Washington (DC): National Academy Press.
635
- 636 Jones, A.P. et al. (2005) 'High prevalence but low impact of data extraction and
637 reporting errors were found in Cochrane systematic reviews', *Journal of Clinical*
638 *Epidemiology*, 58(7), pp. 741–742. Available at:
639 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2004.11.024>
640
- 641 Kang, J., Kim, H. and Cho, O-H. (2023) 'Quiet quitting among healthcare professionals
642 in hospital environments: a concept analysis and scoping review protocol', *BMJ Open*,
643 13(11), e077811, pp. 1–7. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2023-077811>

644 Khalil, H. et al. (2021) 'Conducting high quality scoping reviews—challenges and
645 solutions', *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 130, pp. 156–160. Available at:
646 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2020.10.009>

647
648 Khalil, H. et al. (2024) 'Automation tools to support undertaking scoping reviews',
649 *Research Synthesis Methods*, 15(6), pp. 839–850. Available at:
650 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1731>

651
652 Kim, L. et al. (2015) 'Defining attributes of patient safety through a concept analysis',
653 *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 71(11), pp. 2490–2504. Available at:
654 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12715>

655
656 Kirkman, M.A. et al. (2015) 'The outcomes of recent patient safety education
657 interventions for trainee physicians and medical students: a systematic review', *BMJ*
658 *Open*, 5, e007705, pp. 1–17. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-007705)
659 [007705](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-007705)

660
661 Kohn, L.T., Corrigan, J.M. and Donaldson, M.S. (eds) (2000) *To err is human: building*
662 *a safer health system*. Washington (DC): National Academy Press.

663
664 Lachman, P. (2021) 'Looking to the future', in Donaldson, L. et al. (eds) *Textbook of*
665 *patient safety and clinical risk management*. Cham: Springer, pp. 45–52.

666
667 Lam, M.T. et al. (2024) 'To use or not to use: ERIC database for medical education
668 research', *Medical Teacher* [Published online ahead of print], 14 November. Available
669 at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2024.2422003>

670
671 Leape, L.L. (2021) *Making healthcare safe: the story of the patient safety movement*.
672 Cham: Springer.

673
674 Lefebvre, C. et al. (2024) 'Technical supplement for chapter 4: searching for and
675 selecting studies', in Higgins, J.P.T. et al. (eds) *Cochrane handbook for systematic*
676 *reviews of interventions*. Version 6.5. Available at:
677 [https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-04-technical-supplement-](https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-04-technical-supplement-searching-and-selecting-studies)
678 [searching-and-selecting-studies](https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-04-technical-supplement-searching-and-selecting-studies) (Accessed: 11 November 2024).

- 679 Levac, D., Colquhoun, H. and O'Brien, K.K. (2010) 'Scoping studies: advancing the
680 methodology', *Implementation Science*, 5, 69, pp. 1–9. Available at:
681 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-5-69>
682
- 683 Lucian Leape Institute at the National Patient Safety Foundation (2010) *Unmet needs:
684 teaching physicians to provide safe patient care: report of the Lucian Leape Institute
685 roundtable on reforming medical education*. Boston (MA): National Patient Safety
686 Foundation.
- 687
- 688 Maeda, S., Kamishiraki, E. and Starkey, J. (2012) 'Patient safety education at
689 Japanese medical schools: results of a nationwide survey', *BMC Research Notes*, 5,
690 226, pp. 1–8. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1756-0500-5-226>
691
- 692 McGowan, J. et al. (2016) 'PRESS peer review of electronic search strategies: 2015
693 guideline statement', *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 75, pp. 40–46. Available at:
694 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.01.021>
695
- 696 McKeown, S. and Mir, Z.M. (2024) 'Considerations for conducting systematic reviews:
697 a follow-up study to evaluate the performance of various automated methods for
698 reference de-duplication', *Research Synthesis Methods*, 15(6), pp. 896–904. Available
699 at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1736>
700
- 701 Munn, Z. et al. (2018) 'Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when
702 choosing between a systematic review or scoping review', *BMC Medical Research
703 Methodology*, 18, 143, pp. 1–7. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x>
704
- 705 Munn, Z. et al. (2023) 'What are scoping reviews? Providing a formal definition of
706 scoping reviews as a type of evidence synthesis', *JBI Evidence Synthesis*, 20(4),
707 pp. 950–952. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.11124/jbies-21-00483>
708
- 709 Nie, Y. et al. (2011) 'Patient safety education for undergraduate medical students: a
710 systematic review', *BMC Medical Education*, 11, 33, pp. 1–8. Available at:
711 <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6920-11-33>

- 712 Nyanchoka, L. et al. (2019) 'A scoping review describes methods used to identify,
713 prioritize and display gaps in health research', *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 109,
714 pp. 99–110. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.01.005>
715
- 716 O'Connor, A.M. et al. (2019) 'A question of trust: can we build an evidence base to
717 gain trust in systematic review automation technologies?', *Systematic Reviews*, 8(1),
718 143, pp. 1–8. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-019-1062-0>
719
- 720 Page, M.J. et al. (2021) 'The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for
721 reporting systematic reviews', *BMJ*, 372, n71, pp. 1–9. Available at:
722 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
723
- 724 Panagioti, M. et al. (2019) 'Prevalence, severity, and nature of preventable patient
725 harm across medical care settings: systematic review and meta-analysis', *BMJ*, 366,
726 l4185, pp. 1–11. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l4185>
727
- 728 Patey, R. et al. (2007) 'Patient safety: helping medical students understand error in
729 healthcare', *Quality & Safety in Health Care*, 16(4), pp. 256–259. Available at:
730 <https://doi.org/10.1136/qshc.2006.021014>
731
- 732 Patient Safety Education Study Group (2009) *Patient safety in health care professional*
733 *educational curricula: examining the learning experience*. Health Committee, The
734 House of Commons. Available at:
735 <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmhealth/151/151we36.htm>
736 (Accessed: 29 September 2024).
737
- 738 Pearson, A. et al. (2024) 'Systematic reviews of textual evidence: narrative, expert
739 opinion or policy', in Aromataris, E. et al. (eds) *JBIM manual for evidence synthesis*.
740 2024 edn. JBI. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-24-04>
741
- 742 Pedersen, K.Z. (2018) *Organizing patient safety: failsafe fantasies and pragmatic*
743 *practices*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
744
- 745 Perneger, T.V. (2006) 'Borges on classification', *International Journal for Quality in*
746 *Health Care*, 18(4), pp. 264–265. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzl008>

- 747 Peters, M.D.J. et al. (2020a) 'Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of
748 scoping reviews', *JB I Evidence Synthesis*, 18(10), pp. 2119–2126. Available at:
749 <https://doi.org/10.11124/jbies-20-00167>
750
- 751 Peters, M.D.J. et al. (2020b) 'Scoping reviews', in Aromataris, E. et al. (eds) *JB I*
752 *manual for evidence synthesis*. 2024 edn. JBI. Available at:
753 <https://doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-24-09>
754
- 755 Peters, M.D.J. et al. (2021) 'Scoping reviews: reinforcing and advancing the
756 methodology and application', *Systematic Reviews*, 10, 263, pp. 1–6. Available at:
757 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-021-01821-3>
758
- 759 Peters, M.D.J. et al. (2022) 'Best practice guidance and reporting items for the
760 development of scoping review protocols', *JB I Evidence Synthesis*, 20(4),
761 pp. 953–968. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.11124/jbies-21-00242>
762
- 763 Pollock, D. et al. (2022) 'Moving from consultation to co-creation with knowledge users
764 in scoping reviews: guidance from the JBI Scoping Review Methodology Group', *JB I*
765 *Evidence Synthesis*, 20(4), pp. 969–979. Available at:
766 <https://doi.org/10.11124/jbies-21-00416>
767
- 768 Pollock, D. et al. (2023) 'Recommendations for the extraction, analysis, and
769 presentation of results in scoping reviews', *JB I Evidence Synthesis*, 21(3),
770 pp. 520–532. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.11124/jbies-22-00123>
771
- 772 Pollock, D. et al. (2024) "How-to: scoping review?", *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*,
773 176, 111572, pp. 1–7. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2024.111572>
774
- 775 Reason, J. (2000) 'Safety paradoxes and safety culture', *Injury Control & Safety*
776 *Promotion*, 7(1), pp. 3–14. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1076/1566-
777 0974\(200003\)7:1;1-V;FT003](https://doi.org/10.1076/1566-0974(200003)7:1;1-V;FT003)
778
- 779 Ricciardi, W. and Cascini, F. (2021) 'Guidelines and safety practices for improving
780 patient safety', in Donaldson, L. et al. (eds) *Textbook of patient safety and clinical risk*
781 *management*. Cham: Springer, pp. 3–18.

- 782 Robson, R.C. et al. (2019) 'Few studies exist examining methods for selecting studies,
783 abstracting data, and appraising quality in a systematic review', *Journal of Clinical*
784 *Epidemiology*, 106, pp. 121–135. Available at:
785 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2018.10.003>
786
- 787 Rodgers, B.L., Jacelon, C.S. and Knafl, K.A. (2018) 'Concept analysis and the
788 advance of nursing knowledge: state of the science', *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*,
789 50(4), pp. 451–459. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jnu.12386>
790
- 791 Sandars, J. (2009) 'Teaching and learning about patient safety', in Hurwitz, B. and
792 Sheikh, A. (eds) *Health care errors and patient safety*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell,
793 pp. 254–261.
794
- 795 Seifouri, V. (2024) 'Professional behaviour in medical practice', in Amarin, Z.O. (ed.)
796 *Advances in medical education and training*. London: IntechOpen (Education and
797 human development, 18), pp. 27–54.
798
- 799 Toulmin, S. (1972) *Human understanding: volume 1: general introduction and part 1:*
800 *the collective use and evolution of concepts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
801
- 802 Tricco, A.C. et al. (2018) 'PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR):
803 checklist and explanation', *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169(7), pp. 467–473. Available
804 at: <https://doi.org/10.7326/m18-0850>
805
- 806 Tricco, A.C. et al. (2024) *Updating the PRISMA reporting guideline for scoping*
807 *reviews: study protocol*. Open Science Framework. Available at:
808 <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/MTA4P>
809
- 810 Vincent, C. (2010) *Patient safety*. 2nd ed. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
811
- 812 Vincent, C. and Amalberti, R. (2015) 'Safety in healthcare is a moving target', *BMJ*
813 *Quality & Safety*, 24(9), pp. 539–540. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2015-](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2015-004403)
814 [004403](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2015-004403)

- 815 Vincent, C. and Amalberti, R. (2016) *Safer healthcare: strategies for the real world*.
816 London: Springer Open.
- 817
- 818 Waffenschmidt, S. et al. (2019) 'Single screening versus conventional double
819 screening for study selection in systematic reviews: a methodological systematic
820 review', *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 19(1), 132, pp. 1–9. Available at:
821 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-019-0782-0>
822
- 823 Walker, L.O. and Avant, K.C. (1983) *Strategies for theory construction in nursing*.
824 Norwalk (CT): Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- 825
- 826 Walker, L.O. and Avant, K.C. (2019) *Strategies for theory construction in nursing*.
827 6th ed. New York (NY): Pearson.
- 828
- 829 Walton, M.M. et al. (2006) 'Developing a national patient safety education framework
830 for Australia', *Quality & Safety in Health Care*, 15(6), pp. 437–442. Available at:
831 <https://doi.org/10.1136/qshc.2006.019216>
832
- 833 Waltz, C.F., Strickland, O.L. and Lenz, E.R. (2017) *Measurement in nursing and health
834 research*. New York (NY): Springer Publishing Company.
- 835
- 836 Watson, G.L. (2017) *Your patient safety survival guide: how to protect yourself and
837 others from medical errors*. London: Rowman & Littlefield.
- 838
- 839 Wears, R.L. and Sutcliffe, K.M. (2019) *Still not safe: patient safety and the
840 middle-managing of American medicine*. Online edn. Available at:
841 <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190271268.001.0001>
842
- 843 Weaver, K. and Mitcham, C. (2008) 'Nursing concept analysis in North America: state
844 of the art', *Nursing Philosophy*, 9(3), pp. 180–194. Available at:
845 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1466-769x.2008.00359.x>
846
- 847 Weingart, S.N. (2005) 'Beyond Babel: prospects for a universal patient safety
848 taxonomy', *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 17(2), pp. 93–94.
849 Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzi029>

- 850 Wilson, J. (1963) *Thinking with concepts*. Reprint. Cambridge: Cambridge University
851 Press, 1999.
- 852
- 853 Wong, B.M. et al. (2010) 'Teaching quality improvement and patient safety to trainees:
854 a systematic review', *Academic Medicine*, 85(9), pp. 1425–1439. Available at:
855 <https://doi.org/10.1097/acm.0b013e3181e2d0c6>
856
- 857 Wong, B.M. (2015) 'Reporting on patient safety and quality improvement education:
858 designing projects for optimal dissemination', *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*,
859 7(4), pp. 513–516. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4300/jgme-d-15-00402.1>
860
- 861 World Health Organization (2009) *WHO patient safety curriculum guide for medical*
862 *schools*. Available at: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241598316>
863 (Accessed: 29 September 2024).
- 864
- 865 World Health Organization (2011) *WHO patient safety curriculum guide:*
866 *multi-professional edition*. Available at: [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241501958)
867 [501958](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241501958) (Accessed: 29 September 2024).
- 868
- 869 World Health Organization (2021) *Global patient safety action plan 2021–2030:*
870 *towards eliminating avoidable harm in health care*. Available at:
871 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240032705> (Accessed: 4 November 2024).
- 872
- 873 World Health Organization (2024) *Global patient safety report 2024*. Available at:
874 <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240095458> (Accessed: 29 September
875 2024).
- 876
- 877 Wu, A.W. (2022) 'Pursuing a saboteur of patient safety: the hidden curriculum', *Journal*
878 *of Patient Safety and Risk Management*, 27(5), pp. 199–200. Available at:
879 <https://doi.org/10.1177/25160435221129332>
880
- 881 Yazdani, S. and Bayazidi, S. (2020) 'Undertaking a concept analysis: a stepwise
882 approach', *International Journal of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Methods*,
883 8(2), pp. 11–18.

- 884 Yazdani, S. and Shokooh, F. (2018) 'Defining doctorateness: a concept analysis',
885 *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 13, pp. 31–48. Available at:
886 <https://doi.org/10.28945/3939>
887
888 Zhou, L. et al. (2024) 'Trends in patient safety education research for healthcare
889 professional students over the past two decades: a bibliometric and content analysis',
890 *Medical Education Online*, 29(1), 2358610, pp. 1–16. Available at:
891 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2024.2358610>

APPENDIX A

Draft search strategy

Search of MEDLINE (Ovid) performed on 3 December 2024

Line	Search query	Records retrieved
1	*Students, Medical/	35,990
2	*Educational Personnel/ or *Faculty/ or *Faculty, Medical/	15,655
3	((learner? or student? or undergraduate?) adj3 medic##?).tw,kf.	70,945
4	((academic? or educator? or faculty or instructor? or lecturer? or professor? or teacher? or trainer? or tutor?) adj3 (clinic###? or medic##?).tw,kf.	64,428
5	(patient safety adj3 (education or instruction or intervention? or learning or simulation? or teaching or training)).tw,kf.	2,139
6	*Education, Medical/ or *Education, Medical, Undergraduate/	68,891
7	*Schools, Medical/ or *Universities/	33,753
8	*Curriculum/	28,174
9	*Learning/ or *Teaching/	29,792
10	((clinical or health care or healthcare or medical) adj education).tw,kf.	73,455
11	((college? or school? or universit#??) adj3 medic##?).tw,kf.	152,376
12	(course? or curricul#?? or education\$2 or program\$4 or syllab#??? or topic guide?).tw,kf.	2,482,165
13	((learn\$4 or teach\$4) adj3 (approach\$2 or method? or pedagog#?? or strateg#??)).tw,kf.	98,845
14	1 or 2 or 3 or 4	146,263
15	6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13	2,701,335
16	5 and 14 and 15	271
17	limit 16 to dt=20140501-20241130	192

adj, adjacency operator; dt, create date field; kf, keyword heading word field; tw, text word field (N.B., includes title and abstract fields); /, medical subject heading; *, focused; #, mandated wildcard operator; ?, optional wildcard operator; \$, truncation operator

APPENDIX B

Draft data extraction instrument

Source citation and research design			Contextual characteristics			Key findings with respect to the review sub-questions														
First author	Year	Citation details (e.g., journal; volume(issue), page(s))	Research design	Medical school / university (Country)	Description of the curriculum	Curriculum implementation (i.e., year–year)	What content representative of patient safety education is included within the curriculum? ^a											Which medical student cohorts are the learners of that content?	What pedagogic approaches are used by educators to teach that content?	
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11			
First author	20XX	Journal; XX(X), XX–XX	Description of the research design	Medical school / university (Country)	Description of curriculum	XXXX–XXXX	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	Description of the medical student cohort(s)	Description of the pedagogic approach(es) used

Legend

1. What is patient safety?
2. Why applying human factors is important for patient safety
3. Understanding systems and the effect of complexity on patient care
4. Being an effective team player
5. Learning from errors to prevent harm
6. Understanding and managing clinical risk
7. Using quality improvement methods to improve care
8. Engaging with patients and carers
9. Infection prevention and control
10. Patient safety and invasive procedures
11. Improving medication safety

^a A closed-ended pre-populated matrix is proposed to categorise content representative of patient safety education. The 11 items correspond to the World Health Organization's (2011) patient safety topics (pp. 18–19).

REFERENCE

World Health Organization (2011) *WHO patient safety curriculum guide: multi-professional edition*. Available at: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241501958> (Accessed: 29 September 2024).