

Enseñanza del parto instrumental con fórceps basado en simulación: una revisión sistemática exploratoria

Simulation-based teaching for instrumental delivery with forceps: a systematic scoping review

Alvaro Herrera ^{1,*}, Diego Berrezueta ², Pablo Celis ³, Nicolas Cruz ⁴, Rosario Acuna ⁵, Catalina Larrain ⁶

ANNEX I

Table 2. Bias assessment according to ROBINS-I (non-randomized studies)

Author, Year	Type of Study	Confounding bias	Bias in participant selection	Bias in intervention classification	Bias due to deviations from the intended intervention	Bias due to missing data	Bias in the measurement of results	Selection bias in reported results	General comments
Becker et al. (2020)	Retrospective cohort study	Moderate	Moderate	Low	High	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate risk of bias due to retrospective selection of participants and lack of blinding in the intervention. Possible bias in reporting of results.
Moreau et al. (2011)	Technical study	High	High	Moderate	Moderate	High	Moderate	Moderate	Because educational outcomes were not assessed directly and it was more technical, there is a high risk of

									selection and measurement bias.
Gossett et al. (2016)	Retrospective cohort study	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	There is a moderate risk of bias due to the retrospective nature of the study and the lack of blinding. The reporting of results is clear and complete.
Daniels et al. (2008)	Prospective observational study	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Lack of blinding in the intervention and selection of participants may introduce bias. However, measurement was objective and results were clear.
Rose et al. (2019)	Prospective cohort study	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate risk of bias in participant selection and in the intervention, as it was not blinded. Results were reported fully and transparently.

Confounding bias: Evaluates the presence of confounding factors that could affect the relationship between the intervention and the outcome, given that there is no randomization in these studies.

Bias in participant selection: Analyzes whether participants were selected in a way that could introduce bias into the results.

Intervention classification bias: Measures whether the intervention was classified correctly and consistently across all participants.

Bias due to deviations from the intended intervention: Evaluates whether the intervention was implemented as intended or whether there were deviations.

Bias due to missing data: Consider whether missing data or participant withdrawal could have affected the results.

Bias in outcome measurement: Examines whether outcomes were measured objectively and without influence.

Selection bias in reported outcomes: Assesses whether all relevant outcomes were reported without omissions.

Table 2. Bias assessment according to RoB 2 (randomized study)

Author, Year	Type of Study	Bias in the randomization process	Bias due to deviations from the assigned intervention	Bias due to missing data	Bias in the measurement of results	Selection bias in reported results	General comments
Wang et al. (2024)	Randomized controlled trial	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Randomization was well described and the intervention was consistently applied. No significant biases were observed in the reporting of results.

Bias in the randomization process: Evaluates whether the allocation of participants was random and well described.

Bias due to deviations from the assigned intervention: Measures whether the intervention was applied consistently and whether participants and evaluators were blinded to avoid influencing the perception of the results.

Bias due to missing data: Analyzes whether missing data could have affected the results.

Bias in outcome measurement: Examines whether outcomes were measured objectively and whether evaluators were blinded to avoid influencing the measurement.

Selection bias in reported outcomes: Determines whether outcomes were reported completely and without omissions, providing a transparent view of the effects of the intervention.

Table 3. SWOT analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) on the use of forceps and simulation methods

Weaknesses	Threats
Lack of standardization in teaching methods and reliance on small sample sizes in studies.	Risk of disappearing use of forceps in obstetric practice due to decreased training opportunities and preference for cesarean sections in complicated situations.

Strengths	Opportunities
High-fidelity simulators that reproduce realistic scenarios and allow immediate feedback, reducing complications, improving confidence and technical skills.	Integration of structured curricula that combine theory and practice, optimizing training for critical procedures requiring the use of forceps.



© 2025 University of Murcia. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 Spain (CC BY-NC-ND) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).