

# Confidence and Certainty in Medical Diagnoses: A Systematic Scoping Review

## **Abstract**

### **Objective**

Overconfidence is an important source of medical error. This review analyses experimental studies of confidence in medical diagnosis to identify factors affecting clinicians' confidence in their diagnoses, and how confidence impacts patient care.

### **Method**

A scoping review of medical and psychological literature was conducted. Articles were categorised according to methodology and clinical speciality. Findings were analysed thematically. Our review methodology adheres to the JBI's PRISMA-ScR Checklist for Scoping Reviews.

### **Data Sources**

We systematically searched SCOPUS, MEDLINE, PsycINFO and Global Health. We then performed citation tracking within these papers' references to identify additional articles.

### **Eligibility criteria**

Papers were included if they reported quantitative results from an empirical study in which participants reported their confidence or certainty during a diagnostic decision. Studies comprised several medical subdisciplines.

### **Results**

79 articles met the inclusion criteria. Across these articles, confidence was not found to be well-calibrated to true diagnostic accuracy regardless of clinician experience. We organised articles under two main themes: the determinants of confidence and the uses of confidence during the patient's care pathway. Confidence is found to be affected by several factors including case complexity, early diagnostic differentials, and the healthcare environment. Factors that affect confidence, but not accuracy, demonstrate how the two can become decoupled, resulting in overconfidence/underconfidence. Confidence is found to affect patient testing, medication administration and referral rates, among other clinical actions.

### **Conclusions**

Improving the calibration of confidence should be a priority for medical education and clinical practice (e.g., via decision aids). We propose a theoretical model of factors that affect diagnostic confidence/certainty and accuracy. Such a model can inform future work on how appropriate diagnostic confidence can be prompted and communicated amongst clinicians.

Word Count: 275

## WHAT IS ALREADY KNOWN ON THIS TOPIC

There is extensive evidence of diagnostic error in most healthcare specialities. It has been suggested that cognitive biases, such as overconfidence, are causally linked with these errors. This study aims to synthesise past work on diagnostic confidence to understand the factors that contribute to clinicians' confidence in their diagnoses, as well as how diagnostic confidence affects treatment and patient care.

## WHAT THIS STUDY ADDS

This review identifies that diagnostic confidence and accuracy have separate contributing factors related to the patient's condition, the clinician making the diagnosis, and the healthcare context. It also identifies pathways by which confidence, and misplaced confidence, can affect diagnosis and patient care. We introduce an integrative model of confidence throughout the patient care process to synthesise current findings and identify opportunities for future research.

## HOW THIS STUDY MIGHT AFFECT RESEARCH, PRACTICE OR POLICY

This study demonstrates the broad importance of calibrated confidence across medical disciplines in two main respects. Firstly, there is little evidence that clinicians' confidence is aligned to their diagnostic accuracy, even when using certain cognitive interventions or aids. Secondly, confidence is predictive of actions in many parts of the patient care process, such as ordering investigations, referrals to specialists or prescribing, which may be suboptimal if confidence is miscalibrated. The proposed conceptual model highlights our current understanding of diagnostic confidence and how future research might focus on underexplored areas, particularly on group decisions, individual differences in confidence, and on the link between information seeking and confidence.


## INTRODUCTION

Accurate medical diagnosis is crucial to safe, high quality patient care and is a core part of a doctor's job. Research on diagnosis has been grounded in the incidence of errors. A report from the US Institute of Medicine<sup>1</sup> concluded that most patients will experience a diagnostic error within their lifetime. Around 32% of clinical errors have been found to be caused by clinician assessment, particularly the clinician's failure to weigh up competing diagnoses<sup>2</sup>. Studies have also investigated the downstream consequences of diagnostic errors. Unnecessary treatment (or 'overtreatment') was estimated to cost the US healthcare system \$158-\$226 billion in 2011<sup>3</sup>. Diagnostic errors lead to longer hospital stays and increased patient mortality<sup>4</sup>.

Heuristics are commonly used in diagnostic decisions that are necessarily based on incomplete, imperfect information and made under time pressure. For example, making a diagnosis may involve considering a hypothesis as likely because the displayed symptoms correspond with a prototypical case of a particular condition<sup>5</sup>. A clinician may have had a recent experience of a patient with a particular condition and, when seeing another patient exhibit similar symptoms, is more likely to diagnose that patient with the same condition<sup>6</sup>. Although these heuristics are often effective, associated cognitive biases are thought to be linked to diagnostic error. One cognitive bias that has been posited as a contributor to

diagnostic error is overconfidence<sup>7</sup>, which may cause an individual clinician to fail to consider alternative diagnoses or lead a clinical team to be overly swayed by one individual's opinion.

Confidence is the subjective assessment of a decision's quality or accuracy<sup>8</sup>. We refer to confidence as being 'calibrated' if it closely predicts objective accuracy (i.e., such that the individual is neither overconfident nor underconfident). In experimental studies, confidence sometimes exhibits impressive calibration to objective accuracy<sup>9</sup>, which is thought to reflect people's ability to evaluate the quality of evidence on which they base their decisions<sup>10</sup>. But calibration is rarely perfect because confidence also depends on factors that do not directly correlate with accuracy, such as the time spent deliberating and the total amount of evidence considered (independent of the quality or consistency of this evidence)<sup>11,12</sup>, as well as the mood<sup>13</sup>, personality<sup>14</sup>, gender<sup>15</sup> and status<sup>16</sup> of the decision maker. The resulting under- and overconfidence matters: overconfident decision makers leap to premature conclusions and ignore useful information or advice, while underconfident decision makers waste time collecting evidence that will not improve their decisions<sup>17</sup>. Effective decision making in groups likewise depends on team members sharing calibrated information about their uncertainty: Confident team members tend to be listened to more, which can lead others astray if they are overconfident<sup>18</sup>. Conversely, underconfident team members may be ignored or may fail to share potentially useful information<sup>19</sup>.



**FIGURE 1: Visual representation of confidence calibration when comparing objective accuracy (x-axis) to subjective confidence (y-axis). Confidence is said to be calibrated when the two are relatively equivalent.**

These features of confidence highlight its potential importance in healthcare, as overconfidence can lead to insufficient consideration of diagnostic alternatives and inadequate care<sup>20</sup>. In the absence of objective feedback, confidence can be used as a marker of how likely someone is to be correct<sup>21</sup>. In medicine, a lack of clearly communicated feedback can cause clinicians to proceed as if they have received positive feedback. This

means that they may not adequately update their internal model of the patient and then increase their confidence inappropriately, whether working individually or in teams<sup>22</sup>.

This scoping review collates and synthesises existing work studying diagnosis as a cognitive process. To our knowledge, this is the first scoping review with such a remit to include studies of confidence across medical subdisciplines, given its broad importance across medicine. The use of scoping review is suitable given this remit. We aimed to identify key determinants of confidence and characterise how judgements of confidence affect the wider medical decision making process. For the purposes of this review, and in common with practice in the reviewed articles, we treat “confidence” and “certainty” as interchangeable terms, while noting that the psychological literature discusses whether they are subtly different concepts<sup>23</sup>. Our full research questions can be found in Box 1.

---

### **BOX 1: Scoping Review Research Questions (Preregistered)**

Primary questions:

- **RQ1:** How calibrated are confidence/certainty judgements made during diagnostic decisions by clinicians relative to their actual accuracy?
- **RQ2:** How are confidence/certainty judgements utilised within the wider diagnostic decision process?

Subsidiary questions:

- **RQ3:** What are the prevalent ways in which diagnostic confidence and certainty are measured and operationalised as variables?
  - **RQ4:** What strategies, tools or frameworks have been used to prompt better calibration of confidence and certainty?
  - **RQ5:** What types of empirical procedures/tasks are used to study confidence and certainty in diagnostic decisions? Do they come to different conclusions?
  - **RQ6:** What are the discrepancies between the concepts/research questions studied in the context of confidence and certainty in the cognitive psychology literature and the medical diagnosis literature?
  - **RQ7:** What areas of research are still underexplored within the context of medical diagnosis?
- 

## **METHODS**

### **Search Strategy**

Our review protocol was preregistered on the Open Science Framework: <https://osf.io/wz5se>. We conducted a systematic scoping review of empirical studies on confidence and certainty in medical diagnosis using JBI’s PRISMA-ScR Checklist for Scoping Reviews<sup>24</sup>. The search strategy was designed in cooperation with a subject specialist

librarian at the University of Oxford's Bodleian Libraries group. The search string comprised keywords that captured the intersection of four elements: confidence/certainty, medical diagnoses, decision making and a study population of medical staff/students (i.e., clinicians, physicians, doctors and medics). The full search terms can be found in Box 2. The databases SCOPUS, MEDLINE, PsycINFO and Global Health were searched during February 2024. Finally, we hand-searched the citations of the included articles from these databases for further relevant articles via backward and forward scanning<sup>25,26</sup>.

---

## **BOX 2: Search Terms**

(clinicians OR physicians OR doctors OR medics)  
AND  
( confiden\* OR uncertain\* OR certain\*)  
AND  
( diagnosis AND medical )  
AND  
( decision OR ( decision AND making ) OR decision-making )

## **Study Selection**

- inclusion criteria: (1) original empirical studies with quantitative results, (2) written in the English language, (3) experimental paradigm uses medical diagnostic decisions, (4) confidence or certainty is measured as a dependent variable (5) any medical discipline.
- Exclusion criteria: editorials, review papers and opinion papers (dissertations with original empirical work were included)

Identified articles were uploaded onto Rayyan (<https://rayyan.ai/>) to detect duplicate papers for manual checking and removal. This is the only part of the review process in which an automation tool is used. Data from the papers was collected using manual review. Research characteristics were derived iteratively and can be found on OSF (<https://osf.io/4g6s3/>).

---

## **Research Synthesis**

Papers selected for review were first categorised by their broad research methodology (e.g., patient vignettes, in situ questionnaires, etc.) and their medical population of study (e.g., medical students, general practitioners/hospital physicians etc.). We reviewed the experimental procedures to extract their key manipulations and independent variables (e.g., case complexity, use of a cognitive intervention, level of medical experience). We also extracted dependent variables as they pertain to confidence/certainty and, where relevant, recording of both diagnostic differentials and information seeking. Each of the paper's key findings were summarised and then all findings were categorised under recurring themes.

## RESULTS

### Findings of Scoping Review

The initial search returned a total of 3,332 articles. Applying the inclusion criteria identified 50 eligible articles. 439 further articles were retrieved for review from the included articles' citations. After applying both exclusions of duplicates and our inclusion criteria, 29 further articles were identified. This produced a total of 79 articles for inclusion and synthesis (see figure 2 for PRISMA diagram). The full set of papers can be found in Table S1 of the Supplemental Materials.




FIGURE 2 – PRISMA Diagram of Literature Review.

### Study Characteristics

Table 1 summarises study characteristics and Figure 3 shows that 36 of the 79 studies (46%) were published since 2019, indicating a recent surge of research interest in this field and the timeliness of this scoping review. The studies appeared in 59 different publications, including both medical and psychological journals, with medical education journals being most common (19 studies). Clinical areas most represented were Primary Care/General Practice, Emergency Medicine and Nursing.

## Research Design

Study designs were split roughly evenly between focusing on how confidence varies across individuals (35 studies) and on how confidence varies according to features of the patient case (31 studies), with remaining (13 studies) studying both. Thirty-four studies (43%) looked at the level of medical experience or training's effect on confidence, either measured as a dependent variable or by recruiting participants in 'novice' versus 'experienced' group. Nineteen studies (24%) manipulated the complexity or difficulty of the patient case. Finally, ten studies (13%) investigated how diagnostic confidence varies with the information presented or the opportunity to seek information.

Most of the studies (44 (56%)) used clinical patient text vignettes. For vignettes, there is an established ground truth in each case (which may not be possible for in situ studies involving real patients) to compare the participants' confidence to their true accuracy in order to gauge calibration. Because vignettes are quick and simple to administer, participants can complete several diagnoses during a single study such that both their confidence and accuracy can be averaged across cases. Other experimental methodologies include the use of imaging (e.g., ECG, X-Rays, MRI) for diagnosis, high-fidelity simulations (either using extended reality tools or a patient mannequin), or questionnaires administered in situ to measure confidence during real patient cases as they are happening (Table 1). The preponderance of vignette studies is noteworthy given the finding from one study that nurses were both less accurate and less confident in a high-fidelity simulation compared to a paper-based vignette<sup>27</sup>, suggesting the need for caution when generalising experimental findings to how medical professionals behave in their everyday practice.


Studies varied in how confidence and diagnostic accuracy were assessed. Studies mostly used a self-reported scale for confidence (usually 1-10 or 1-100) as opposed to verbal expressions of confidence (e.g., "not sure" to "certain") or visual analogue scales. The use of self-report numerical scales is common within cognitive psychology, where measured confidence values predict other behavioural indices of uncertainty, such as the tendency to seek further information or to opt out of making a decision<sup>28</sup>. Twenty-four studies (30%) allowed participants to input multiple diagnostic differentials rather than a single diagnosis. Confidence is then either measured for each differential or in the set of differentials as a whole.

In terms of accuracy, most studies prompt clinicians for a single diagnosis that is marked as correct or incorrect. However, clinicians may consider multiple possible diagnoses in their everyday practice. Hence, 24 studies (30%) allowed participants to record multiple differentials in their diagnosis. This complicates scoring accuracy and confidence: If accuracy is operationalised as whether a correct diagnosis is included in this set of multiple differentials, clinicians are more likely to be correct with more differentials, and it may remain unclear how clinicians weigh up competing differentials. Hence, the operationalised calibration of confidence judgements is heavily contingent on how diagnoses are recorded.



Publication Year		Subdiscipline / Population	
1991-2000	10	Primary Care / General Practice	26
2001-2010	11	Medical Students	15
2011-2020	29	Emergency Medicine	10
2021-	29	Nursing	6
		Pathology	4
Study Environment/Context		Radiology	4
Text Vignette	44	Other	14
Imaging Interpretation (e.g. ECG)	20		
In Situ Questionnaires/Surveys	13	Study Population Sample Size	
High-Fidelity Simulation	2	< 100	44
		101-200	20
Participant Experience Levels		201-300	9
Fixed Across Participants	50	> 300	6
Multiple Experience Groups	29	Total	79

**TABLE 1: Characteristics of Included Studies, including year of publication, study environment used and medical population (recruiting single or multiple levels of participant experience, medical subdiscipline, sample size). A full list of all included papers can be found in the Supplemental Materials (Table S1).**



**FIGURE 3 – Distribution of Papers by Publication Year**

## Emerging Research Themes

### *Miscalibration of Confidence and Certainty Judgements to Objective Accuracy*

Calibration is assessed by comparing confidence ratings with objective diagnostic accuracy: When clinicians rate 100% (or 50% or 60%, etc.) certainty in their diagnosis, are they in fact correct 100% (or 50%, 60%, etc.) of the time? Calibration is then an indirect measure that is calculated by comparing two other observed measures: confidence and accuracy. In our study sample, there was limited evidence of calibrated confidence judgements, with some studies reporting underconfidence<sup>27,29,30</sup> and others overconfidence<sup>31-33</sup>. To examine these findings in more detail, we considered factors that impact and promote calibration in diagnoses.

### *The Impact of Experience on Calibration*

The first major theme of interest is whether calibration improves with experience. This was not always observed in the results<sup>34,35</sup>. However, experienced clinicians seem better able to identify when a case is more complex and adjust their confidence accordingly<sup>36,37</sup>. Looking at the link between calibration and experience alone may be too simplistic, and there are other aspects of experience that influence diagnoses. Experienced clinicians were found to be less likely to 'distort' neutral information to be in support of their reported diagnoses, indicating a lower tendency toward confirmation bias<sup>38</sup>. Past work has also suggested a distinction between experience (operationalised as years of experience or role seniority) and knowledge (measured using standardised tests of medical knowledge). In medical students, the calibration of confidence judgements were found to improve with years of education but not with medical knowledge<sup>39</sup>. Information 'distortion' was found to affect novice clinicians more<sup>38</sup> and lower knowledge was found to be related to higher susceptibility to irrelevant, distracting features of a patient<sup>40</sup>. However, the latter study from Mamede et al (2024) found that medical knowledge on the part of resident physicians was not directly associated with calibration.

### *The Impact of Contextual Factors on Calibration*

The second major theme relates to contextual and environmental factors. Studies have found that calibration is affected by the complexity or difficulty of the presented case<sup>41-43</sup>. When confidence judgements are not sensitive to the difficulty or complexity of the case, confidence stays fairly constant for difficult cases whilst accuracy decreases, leading to increased overconfidence (and decreased calibration)<sup>41</sup>. In past studies, complexity is manipulated by either presenting patient cases with more comorbid conditions<sup>42</sup> or by showing conflicting information about the patient to indicate multiple possible conditions<sup>34</sup>. Calibration can be improved by the presence of feedback during a training period<sup>44,45</sup>.

Contextual factors that pertain to the situated medical environment can also affect overall levels of confidence (rather than calibration), as found using naturalistic paradigms. For example, clinicians may be constantly interrupted by other tasks<sup>46</sup>, especially during busier shifts where they have to manage more patients<sup>47</sup> and may not be present for the sharing of information during handovers<sup>48</sup>. Studies that simulated these situations found they resulted

in lower diagnostic confidence. However, such studies cannot assess the effect of contextual factors on confidence calibration with diagnostic accuracy because they were conducted in-situ, meaning that researchers do not yet have a ground truth of the patient's condition. At this stage, we can only determine how these contextual factors affect confidence, rather than calibration.

---

### **BOX 3: Papers on Imaging and Decision Support Systems**

A subset of papers found evidence for an increase in confidence when providing clinicians with specialised imaging for a patient to assist diagnoses, be they MRI scans<sup>49-50</sup>, CT scans<sup>51</sup>, evacuation proctography<sup>52</sup> or photos of wounds<sup>53</sup>. Another subset of papers used various forms of computer-aided decision support systems with the goal of increasing confidence<sup>54-57</sup>. Hillson, Conelly & Liu (1995) found that the adoption of diagnoses that were recommended by a computer-aided decision support system was not associated with an increase in confidence. Neugebauer, Ebert & Vogelmann (2020) did find evidence for such an association, however, with use of decision support leading to both increased confidence and increased diagnostic accuracy when compared to diagnoses made without using the system. On the other hand, both Berner & Maisiak (1999) and Dreiseitl & Binder (2005) found that usage of decision support recommendations were associated with lower confidence when compared with decisions in which such recommendations were not utilised. Taken as a whole, whilst useful imaging increases confidence when available to clinicians, the efficacy of decision support systems at increasing confidence is likely dependent on other factors that require future work to elucidate.

---

### *Interventions at the Point of Generating Differentials*

The process of generating diagnostic differentials has been subject to experimental manipulations and interventions (such as early diagnostic suggestions) to investigate their effect on accuracy and confidence. This work is applicable, for instance, to understanding how a clinician transitions care of a patient to another clinician and gives a handover of relevant information. A general theme of this work is that there is a tendency toward higher weighting of early information. Early diagnostic suggestions have been found to be highly influential in the subsequent decision process where clinicians find these suggestions difficult to ignore and have more confidence in them<sup>58-59</sup>. This also affects the breadth of differentials considered, with fewer differentials considered when provided with early suggestions<sup>60</sup> and an underweighting of differentials if they were considered later in the diagnostic process<sup>61</sup>. Interventions aimed at mitigating this tendency by asking clinicians to explicitly consider alternatives, increased their accuracy and calibration<sup>62</sup>, or prompting the consideration of the patient's 'red flags' in diagnoses, which increased confidence on simpler cases but not accuracy<sup>63</sup>. These interventions seem to require explicit instructions: Simply asking clinicians to reflect on their decision without guidance<sup>64,65</sup> or participate in an educational training course<sup>66-67</sup> does not seem to improve diagnostic accuracy and calibration.

Studies have also investigated how confidence is affected by the manner in which information is presented to clinicians during the diagnostic process. Higher confidence was found when clinicians were presented with additional patient information even when this did not carry diagnostic value<sup>68</sup> and when given all available patient information rather than having to gather information themselves<sup>69</sup>. Clinicians were also found to be more confident and more accurate when presented with an Electronic Health Record of the patient alongside other information<sup>70</sup> and when presented with the patient history first rather than out of order<sup>71</sup>. This finding indicates that complete patient history available early on has a positive impact on confidence. However, an erroneous patient history has also been found to cue both novice and experienced clinicians to incorrect diagnoses whilst confidence remained relatively high, resulting in overconfidence<sup>72</sup>.

### *Uses of Confidence*

With more naturalistic studies, it is possible to isolate ways in which confidence is utilised within the wider diagnostic process, especially where healthcare involves transitions of care between multiple clinicians and departments. Past work has attempted to establish a link between confidence and further seeking of patient information and tests, with mixed results. US hospitalists (medical staff who provide care for patients specifically within US hospitals) with lower confidence were found to order more tests<sup>47</sup> whilst pathologists who were better calibrated (i.e., who tended to report confidence judgements that were closer to their true accuracy) were found to be more likely to request further tests when they were unsure<sup>37</sup>. Confidence has also been linked to prescribing medication, though overtreatment with unnecessary medications has been linked to both underconfidence<sup>73</sup> and overconfidence<sup>33</sup>. Higher confidence has also been linked to more referrals to specialists in other departments<sup>74</sup> and to a lower willingness to admit mistakes<sup>30</sup>. One study found that whilst experienced clinicians were not more accurate in their initial diagnoses, they were more willing to change diagnoses and request more information<sup>75</sup>. Lower confidence has been found to result in less specific diagnoses for patients in situ<sup>76</sup>. Although psychology research on confidence has examined its role within groups (as discussed in the Introduction), only one article looked at confidence in group decisions in medicine. This study found that a multidisciplinary panel was more confident and better calibrated than a single clinician<sup>77</sup>.


### *Conceptual Model for Diagnostic Decisions*

We synthesised the reviewed findings into a theoretical model (Figure 4) that illustrates how various factors distinctly impact diagnostic confidence and accuracy. This model aims to clarify existing research and identify directions for future work. The model starts by mapping out the stages of the diagnostic process (Figure 4, bottom panel). Based on initial patient presentation, clinicians gather and interpret patient information (e.g. history, examinations, tests) to inform their diagnosis of the patient's condition. The clinician's confidence in their diagnosis guides their judgment on when they have enough information to begin treatment versus whether further tests or additional information are needed. Once a diagnosis is reached, this guides patient treatment and care, the success of which is evident in the outcome for the patient.

The middle panel of Figure 4 characterises the cognitive processes of the clinician that determine the accuracy of the diagnosis and confidence with which the diagnosis is made. A key feature is that many factors have dissociable effects on accuracy vs. confidence. Diagnostic accuracy depends more on the level of medical knowledge and the quality of information gathering and interpretation; confidence depends more on years of medical experience and the quantity of information gathered<sup>38-40</sup>. Knowledge is improved through feedback on how a patient case was handled and its outcome, which in turn improves future diagnostic accuracy (though this feedback loop's impact on later confidence is yet to be explored).

The top panel of Figure 4 highlights factors pertaining to the medical environment/context. Separately from the patient case, confidence is reduced by time pressures<sup>27</sup>, interruptions to work<sup>46</sup>, busy shifts<sup>47</sup> and complex patient cases<sup>41-43</sup> (either due to conflicting information or comorbidities).

Figure 4 highlights three primary directions for future research. First, given the focus of research to date on diagnosis by individual clinicians, we recommend that future work also studies diagnoses in groups, given that diagnoses are often made by teams rather than individuals, particularly in secondary care settings. This is especially pertinent given the social influence that experience/seniority can have within a group: junior clinicians may be less likely to speak up about potential errors in the presence of more experienced clinicians<sup>78</sup>. Second, future work should study individual differences on the part of clinicians to characterise how personality and trait level factors impact diagnostic confidence. In particular, factors such as personality<sup>14</sup>, gender<sup>15</sup> and status<sup>16</sup> may impact a clinician's confidence in their diagnoses. Finally, we recommend future work investigate the association between the ongoing receipt of information and confidence. We recommend future work on the implications of diagnosis as a dynamic process where confidence and information seeking interact. Past work has tended to frame information seeking as a further action after diagnosis, rather than information seeking as a process that forms the diagnosis in the first place. Future work should prioritise examining how to prompt appropriate information seeking (i.e., neither overtesting nor undertesting) via educational tools or cognitive interventions.



**FIGURE 4: Conceptual model that depicts the various factors that impact the course of a diagnostic process, with links established between concepts based on findings from this systematic scoping review. Factors are categorised in three levels: the level of the diagnostic decision process (bottom box, blue, where the course of the decision proceeds from left to right), the level of the clinician (middle box, pink) and the level of the environmental context within which the clinician operates (top box, yellow). Black arrows represent a progression from one concept to another. Green arrows indicate positive impacts between concepts; red arrows indicate the opposite (i.e. a negative relationship). Orange arrows represent links between concepts that are areas for future research. Light grey boxes represent factors that are known to affect decisions and confidence within the psychology literature but are currently less understood in the context of medical decisions.**

## DISCUSSION

The present work comprehensively maps out the literature on confidence in medical diagnoses, thus extending previous work exploring how cognitive biases contribute to medical error<sup>79-81</sup> and characterising medical uncertainty more broadly<sup>82,83</sup>. This scoping review shows the importance of, and the recent surge in interest in, diagnostic confidence. Although confidence has been linked to diagnostic error in the past<sup>7</sup>, full understanding will benefit from leveraging insights from cognitive psychology to inform medical education and practice<sup>84</sup>. How clinicians evaluate their decisions contributes to their effectiveness: An overconfident clinician may overlook diagnostic possibilities, delay treatment or ignore crucial information. Conversely, an underconfident clinician may be less likely to speak up in a group about potential errors<sup>78</sup>.

Our review finds that confidence and accuracy are rarely aligned during diagnoses. Notably, miscalibration of confidence is not only a function of social and environmental factors: Miscalibration is consistently observed in vignette studies performed by individual participants, where decision makers tend to be overconfident particularly when dealing with complex cases. Nevertheless, social and environmental factors may amplify systematic tendencies toward misaligned confidence/certainty. Overconfidence is associated with overlooking differentials, ignoring important patient information and being less willing to admit mistakes. Hence, mitigating overconfidence is an important direction for future research. Underconfidence has received less attention, but is observed in medical trainees<sup>27,29,30</sup> and can lead to negative outcomes such as delayed treatment<sup>85</sup> and ordering of unnecessary tests<sup>47</sup>. Interventions have been tested to improve confidence calibration (such as considering alternative diagnoses and guided reflection), but these have not proven fully successful<sup>64,65</sup>. More work is therefore needed to design interventions to improve calibration, as one can surmise here a link between miscalibrated confidence and suboptimal patient care. Findings from metacognition are already being used to inform educational practices outside medicine to improve students' memory retention<sup>86,87</sup>. Although cognitive interventions such as considering alternative diagnoses and guided reflections have been tested, there is yet to be a standardised cognitive framework to teach non-technical skills such as constructive confrontation or expressions of uncertainty.

Our conceptual model of the diagnostic decision process reflects how different levels of factors (related to clinician and environmental context) differently impact accuracy and confidence. This model demonstrates the importance of both behavioural and work system factors within healthcare and how environmental aspects can inform an individual's decision process. Considering the work environment is important given our findings of lower confidence due to environmental factors such as shift busyness and time pressures. This corresponds with other findings of stress being associated with decreased confidence for intermediate levels of uncertainty<sup>88</sup> and this stress could be contributed to by the healthcare environment that the clinician operates in. Future interventions on diagnosis can refer to this model to understand the part and context of the decision process at which they are administering the intervention.

Beyond these key research themes, two further points emerge from the scope and variety of work identified in our review. First, our review highlights the broad relevance of confidence across different medical subdisciplines, suggesting the value of focusing on confidence calibration within medical education as a generally applicable approach to improve diagnostic decisions. Second, in terms of methodology, we find that confidence and certainty have been studied in a variety of ways (e.g. using 'assessments' or 'interpretations' as well as diagnostic decisions), but can sometimes be seen a primary outcome measure to improve. Increasing the confidence of clinicians without considering their objective accuracy may exacerbate instances of overconfidence. Future work should focus instead on prompting calibrated rather than increased confidence given the aforementioned impacts on patient care. As objective feedback is often unattainable in medical settings, confidence could be studied using methodologies like virtual reality and high-fidelity simulations that better emulate real medical settings when compared to vignette methodologies whilst also having markers of objective accuracy.

## Implications for Future Clinical Research

The current healthcare context presents additional challenges to clinicians with substantial increases in clinical workload in the aftermath of the pandemic, and workforce stress and burnout at their highest in the NHS since recording began<sup>89</sup>. Support to enhance clinical decision making through improved confidence/accuracy calibration could help to relieve pressure on the frontline.

Through our conceptual model of the diagnostic process, we identify three primary areas for future work that have been relatively underexplored in the extant literature. First, the majority of the studies we reviewed have studied diagnosis as a linear process in which information is presented sequentially prior to a final diagnosis, at which point confidence is assessed. This is a helpful idealisation of a process that is often more complex and dynamic in practice, with diagnosis evolving via back-and-forth between seeking information and evaluating that information in the context of currently considered diagnostic possibilities. Moreover, patients' unexpected responses to initial treatment can lead to revision of an initial diagnosis and prompt further information seeking. Effects of (miscalibrated) confidence are likely to be amplified within these dynamics, such as an overconfident clinician paying too much attention to evidence supporting their diagnosis and neglecting opposing evidence, resulting in greater overconfidence. These dynamics could be studied in more naturalistic, in situ methodologies that are closer to everyday medical practice. Interrupting clinicians in real time to report their diagnostic thinking can be a distraction and potentially a patient safety risk. However, some methodologies permit capturing diagnostic reasoning as it evolves with time and the receipt of new information, such as asking clinicians to think aloud as they make diagnoses<sup>90</sup> or using a visual representation of clinicians' thought processes to capture paths and sources of diagnoses<sup>62</sup>. The use of high-fidelity or virtual reality simulations may also be useful for emulating the pressure and work environment of the clinician (which may affect decision making)<sup>91,92</sup>, as well as providing an actual 'patient' to observe (unlike in textual vignettes). Use of such paradigms would also improve the generalisability of results.

Secondly, the vast majority of studies have investigated confidence from the perspective of individual clinicians. However, diagnosis and treatment decisions are often made by teams rather than individuals, particularly in secondary care settings. Evidence from organisational psychology indicates that group decisions depend critically on communicated confidence and uncertainty<sup>19</sup>: Overconfident team members can anchor a group on an incorrect decision<sup>93</sup>. Conversely, underconfident team members may fail to share important information that is unknown to the rest of the group, exacerbating the problems of 'hidden information' and 'shared information bias'<sup>94</sup>. In addition, clinicians may modify how they communicate certainty with others, especially given the collaborative nature of healthcare and the social benefits of communicating opinions with confidence in order to be listened to in a group<sup>30</sup>. Situational awareness (SA) is also important in a group, and higher stress may be associated with overconfidence in SA<sup>95</sup>. Taken together, group medical decisions are clearly an important and naturalistic area for future study.

Finally, the papers in this review have also not looked at individual differences in expressions of confidence, where past work from cognitive psychology has found individual



systematic tendencies toward higher or lower confidence<sup>96,97</sup>. Hence, individual clinicians may have a consistent tendency toward underconfidence or overconfidence that impacts their clinical practice and that training or cognitive aids could address.

## CONCLUSIONS

This scoping review indicates that confidence is frequently not calibrated to accuracy during diagnostic decision making processes. We also found across the literature that different factors affect confidence and accuracy separately, which may help to explain instances of overconfidence or underconfidence. Finally, we identified several papers that underscore how confidence affects the subsequent care pathway of patients and its importance for future study. We have proposed a conceptual model of diagnosis that could be utilised by future researchers to identify where interventions for prompting appropriate diagnostic confidence can target specific parts of the decision process. More holistically, the review has demonstrated how diagnostic confidence is a result of the individual clinician, the patient they are treating and the environmental context the clinician works in. Future cognitive or human factors interventions should consider targeting interventions across these levels to support more accurate decision making and improved patient safety.

We have no competing interests to disclose. This work has not been previously published or presented at a conference. This work was done as part of a PhD at the University of Oxford, which was funded by Wolfson College, Oxford via the Oxford-Wolfson Marriott Graduate Scholarship (Reference: SFF2122\_OGSMF-OWM\_1466776).

## REFERENCES

1. McGlynn EA, McDonald KM, Cassel CK. Measurement is essential for improving diagnosis and reducing diagnostic error: a report from the Institute of Medicine. [Jama](#). 2015 Dec 15;314(23):2501-2.
2. Schiff GD, Hasan O, Kim S, Abrams R, Cosby K, Lambert BL, Elstein AS, Hasler S, Kabongo ML, Krosnjak N, Odwazny R. Diagnostic error in medicine: analysis of 583 physician-reported errors. [Archives of internal medicine](#). 2009 Nov 9;169(20):1881-7.
3. Berwick DM, Hackbarth AD. Eliminating waste in US health care. [Jama](#). 2012 Apr 11;307(14):1513-6.
4. Hautz WE, Kämmer JE, Hautz SC, Sauter TC, Zwaan L, Exadaktylos AK, Birrenbach T, Maier V, Müller M, Schaubert SK. Diagnostic error increases mortality and length of hospital stay in patients presenting through the emergency room. [Scandinavian journal of trauma, resuscitation and emergency medicine](#). 2019 Dec;27:1-2.
5. Restrepo D, Armstrong KA, Metlay JP. Annals clinical decision making: avoiding cognitive errors in clinical decision making. [Annals of internal medicine](#). 2020 Jun 2;172(11):747-51.
6. Mamede S, van Gog T, van den Berge K, Rikers RM, van Saase JL, van Guldener C, Schmidt HG. Effect of availability bias and reflective reasoning on diagnostic accuracy among internal medicine residents. [Jama](#). 2010 Sep 15;304(11):1198-203.

7. Berner ES, Graber ML. Overconfidence as a cause of diagnostic error in medicine. [The American journal of medicine](#). 2008 May 1;121(5):S2-3.
8. Fleming SM, Daw ND. Self-evaluation of decision-making: A general Bayesian framework for metacognitive computation. [Psychological review](#). 2017 Jan;124(1):91.
9. Boldt A, Yeung N. Shared neural markers of decision confidence and error detection. *Journal of Neuroscience*. 2015 Feb 25;35(8):3478-84.
10. Shekhar M, Rahnev D. How do humans give confidence? A comprehensive comparison of process models of perceptual metacognition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. 2023 Dec 14.
11. Kiani R, Corthell L, Shadlen MN. Choice certainty is informed by both evidence and decision time. *Neuron*. 2014 Dec 17;84(6):1329-42.
12. Ko YH, Feuerriegel D, Turner W, Overhoff H, Niessen E, Stahl J, Hester R, Fink GR, Weiss PH, Bode S. Divergent effects of absolute evidence magnitude on decision accuracy and confidence in perceptual judgements. *Cognition*. 2022 Aug 1;225:105125.
13. Rouault M, Seow T, Gillan CM, Fleming SM. Psychiatric symptom dimensions are associated with dissociable shifts in metacognition but not task performance. *Biological psychiatry*. 2018 Sep 15;84(6):443-51.
14. Schaefer PS, Williams CC, Goodie AS, Campbell WK. Overconfidence and the big five. *Journal of research in Personality*. 2004 Oct 1;38(5):473-80.
15. Syzmanowicz A, Furnham A. Gender differences in self-estimates of general, mathematical, spatial and verbal intelligence: Four meta analyses. *Learning and individual Differences*. 2011 Oct 1;21(5):493-504.
16. See KE, Morrison EW, Rothman NB, Soll JB. The detrimental effects of power on confidence, advice taking, and accuracy. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*. 2011 Nov 1;116(2):272-85.
17. Desender K, Boldt A, Yeung N. Subjective confidence predicts information seeking in decision making. *Psychological science*. 2018 May;29(5):761-78.
18. Zarnoth P, Sniezek JA. The social influence of confidence in group decision making. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 1997 Jul 1;33(4):345-66.
19. Silver I, Mellers BA, Tetlock PE. Wise teamwork: Collective confidence calibration predicts the effectiveness of group discussion. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 2021 Sep 1;96:104157.
20. Kovacs RJ, Lagarde M, Cairns J. Overconfident health workers provide lower quality healthcare. *Journal of Economic Psychology*. 2020 Jan 1;76:102213.
21. Price PC, Stone ER. Intuitive evaluation of likelihood judgment producers: Evidence for a confidence heuristic. [Journal of Behavioral Decision Making](#). 2004 Jan;17(1):39-57.
22. Jaspan O, Wysocka A, Sanchez C, Schweitzer AD. Improving the relationship between confidence and competence: implications for diagnostic radiology training from the psychology and medical literature. [Academic Radiology](#). 2022 Mar 1;29(3):428-38.
23. Pouget A, Drugowitsch J, Kepecs A. Confidence and certainty: distinct probabilistic quantities for different goals. *Nature neuroscience*. 2016 Mar;19(3):366-74.
24. Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Munn Z, Tricco AC, Khalil, H. Chapter 11: Scoping Reviews (2020 version). In: Aromataris E, Munn Z (Editors). , JBI, 2020. Available JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis from <https://synthesismanual.jbi.glo>

25. Tranfield D, Denyer D, Smart P. Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British journal of management*. 2003 Sep;14(3):207-22.
26. Webster J, Watson RT. Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. *MIS quarterly*. 2002 Jun 1:xiii-xiii.
27. Yang H, Thompson C, Bland M. The effect of clinical experience, judgment task difficulty and time pressure on nurses' confidence calibration in a high fidelity clinical simulation. *BMC medical informatics and decision making*. 2012 Dec;12:1-9.
28. Gherman S, Philastides MG. Neural representations of confidence emerge from the process of decision formation during perceptual choices. *Neuroimage*. 2015 Feb 1;106:134-43.
29. Mann D. The Relationship between Diagnostic Accuracy and Confidence in Medical Students. [ERIC](#)
30. Brezis M, Orkin-Bedolach Y, Fink D, Kiderman A. Does Physician's Training Induce Overconfidence That Hampers Disclosing Errors?. [Journal of Patient Safety](#). 2019 Dec 1;15(4):296-8.
31. Friedman C, Gatti G, Elstein A, Franz T, Murphy G, Wolf F. Are clinicians correct when they believe they are correct? Implications for medical decision support. In *MEDINFO 2001* (pp. 454-458). IOS Press.
32. Fernández-Aguilar C, Martín-Martín JJ, Minué Lorenzo S, Fernández Ajuria A. Use of heuristics during the clinical decision process from family care physicians in real conditions. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*. 2022 Feb;28(1):135-41.
33. Garbayo LS, Harris DM, Fiore SM, Robinson M, Kibble JD. A metacognitive confidence calibration (MCC) tool to help medical students scaffold diagnostic reasoning in decision-making during high-fidelity patient simulations. *Advances in Physiology Education*. 2023 Mar 1;47(1):71-81.
34. Yang H, Thompson C. Nurses' risk assessment judgements: A confidence calibration study. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 2010 Dec;66(12):2751-60.
35. Clayton DA, Eguchi MM, Kerr KF, Miyoshi K, Brunyé TT, Drew T, Weaver DL, Elmore JG. Are Pathologists Self-Aware of Their Diagnostic Accuracy? Metacognition and the Diagnostic Process in Pathology. *Medical Decision Making*. 2023 Feb;43(2):164-74.
36. Brannon LA, Carson KL. Nursing expertise and information structure influence medical decision making. [Applied Nursing Research](#). 2003 Nov 1;16(4):287-90.
37. Tabak N, Bar-Tal Y, Cohen-Mansfield J. Clinical decision making of experienced and novice nurses. [Western Journal of Nursing Research](#). 1996 Oct;18(5):534-47.
38. Kostopoulou O, Russo JE, Keenan G, Delaney BC, Douiri A. Information distortion in physicians' diagnostic judgments. *Medical Decision Making*. 2012 Nov;32(6):831-9.
39. Hautz WE, Schubert S, Schaubert SK, Kunina-Habenicht O, Hautz SC, Kämmer JE, Eva KW. Accuracy of self-monitoring: does experience, ability or case difficulty matter?. [Medical education](#). 2019 Jul;53(7):735-44.
40. Mamede S, Zandbergen A, de Carvalho-Filho MA, Choi G, Goeijenbier M, van Ginkel J, Zwaan L, Paas F, Schmidt HG. Role of knowledge and reasoning processes as predictors of resident physicians' susceptibility to anchoring bias in diagnostic reasoning: a randomised controlled experiment. *BMJ Quality & Safety*. 2024 Feb 16.
41. Meyer AN, Payne VL, Meeks DW, Rao R, Singh H. Physicians' diagnostic accuracy, confidence, and resource requests: a vignette study. *JAMA internal medicine*. 2013 Nov 25;173(21):1952-8.

42. Hausmann D, Kiesel V, Zimmerli L, Schlatter N, von Gunten A, Wattinger N, Rosemann T. Sensitivity for multimorbidity: The role of diagnostic uncertainty of physicians when evaluating multimorbid video case-based vignettes. *PloS one*. 2019 Apr 10;14(4):e0215049.
43. Li S, Zheng J, Lajoie SP. The relationship between cognitive engagement and students' performance in a simulation-based training environment: an information-processing perspective. *Interactive Learning Environments*. 2023 Apr 3;31(3):1532-45.
44. Kuhn J, van den Berg P, Mamede S, Zwaan L, Bindels P, van Gog T. Improving medical residents' self-assessment of their diagnostic accuracy: does feedback help?. [Advances in Health Sciences Education](#). 2022 Mar;27(1):189-200.
45. Staal J, Katarya K, Speelman M, Brand R, Alisma J, Sloane J, Van den Broek WW, Zwaan L. Impact of performance and information feedback on medical interns' confidence—accuracy calibration. [Advances in Health Sciences Education](#). 2023 Jun 17:1-7.
46. Soares III WE, Price LL, Prast B, Tarbox E, Mader TJ, Blanchard R. Accuracy screening for ST elevation myocardial infarction in a task-switching simulation. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2019 Jan;20(1):177.
47. Gupta AB, Greene MT, Fowler KE, Chopra VI. Associations Between Hospitalist Shift Busyness, Diagnostic Confidence, and Resource Utilization: A Pilot Study. *Journal of Patient Safety*. 2023 Oct 1;19(7):447-52.
48. Bergl PA, Shukla N, Shah J, Khan M, Patel JJ, Nanchal RS. Factors influencing diagnostic accuracy among intensive care unit clinicians—an observational study. *Diagnosis*. 2024 Feb 19;11(1):31-9.
49. Mackenzie R, Dixon AK, Keene GS, Hollingworth W, Lomas DJ, Villar RN. Magnetic resonance imaging of the knee: assessment of effectiveness. *Clinical radiology*. 1996 Apr 1;51(4):245-50.
50. Albrechtsen SS, Riis RG, Amiri M, Tanum G, Bergdal O, Blaabjerg M, Simonsen CZ, Kondziella D. Impact of MRI on decision-making in ICU patients with disorders of consciousness. *Behavioural Brain Research*. 2022 Mar 12;421:113729.
51. Abujudeh HH, Kaewlai R, McMahon PM, Binder W, Novelline RA, Gazelle GS, Thrall JH. Abdominopelvic CT increases diagnostic certainty and guides management decisions: a prospective investigation of 584 patients in a large academic medical center. *American Journal of Roentgenology*. 2011 Feb;196(2):238-43.
52. Harvey CJ, Halligan S, Bartram CI, Hollings N, Sahdev A, Kingston K. Evacuation proctography: a prospective study of diagnostic and therapeutic effects. *Radiology*. 1999 Apr;211(1):223-7.
53. Sanger PC, Simianu VV, Gaskill CE, Armstrong CA, Hartzler AL, Lordon RJ, Lober WB, Evans HL. Diagnosing surgical site infection using wound photography: a scenario-based study. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*. 2017 Jan 1;224(1):8-15.
54. Hillson SD, Connelly DP, Liu Y. The effects of computer-assisted electrocardiographic interpretation on physicians' diagnostic decisions. *Medical Decision Making*. 1995 Jun;15(2):107-12.
55. Berner ES, Maisiak RS. Influence of case and physician characteristics on perceptions of decision support systems. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 1999 Sep 1;6(5):428-34.

56. Dreiseitl S, Binder M. Do physicians value decision support? A look at the effect of decision support systems on physician opinion. *Artificial intelligence in medicine*. 2005 Jan 1;33(1):25-30.
57. Neugebauer M, Ebert M, Vogelmann R. A clinical decision support system improves antibiotic therapy for upper urinary tract infection in a randomized single-blinded study. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2020 Dec;20:1-0.
58. Kämmer JE, Schaubert SK, Hautz SC, Stroben F, Hautz WE. Differential diagnosis checklists reduce diagnostic error differentially: a randomised experiment. *Medical education*. 2021 Oct;55(10):1172-82.
59. Kourtidis P, Nurek M, Delaney B, Kostopoulou O. Influences of early diagnostic suggestions on clinical reasoning. *Cognitive Research: Principles and Implications*. 2022 Dec 15;7(1):103.
60. Staal J, Speelman M, Brand R, Alsma J, Zwaan L. Does a suggested diagnosis in a general practitioners' referral question impact diagnostic reasoning: an experimental study. *BMC Medical Education*. 2022 Apr 8;22(1):256.
61. Eva WK. The influence of differentially processing evidence on diagnostic decision-making (Doctoral dissertation).
62. Feyzi-Behnagh R, Azevedo R, Legowski E, Reitmeyer K, Tseytlin E, Crowley RS. Metacognitive scaffolds improve self-judgments of accuracy in a medical intelligent tutoring system. *Instructional science*. 2014 Mar;42:159-81.
63. Chartan C, Singh H, Krishnamurthy P, Sur M, Meyer A, Lutfi R, Stark J, Thammasitboon S. Isolating red flags to enhance diagnosis (I-RED): an experimental vignette study. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2019 Oct 31;31(8):G97-102.
64. Lambe KA, Hevey D, Kelly BD. Guided reflection interventions show no effect on diagnostic accuracy in medical students. *Frontiers in psychology*. 2018 Nov 23;9:285916.
65. Costa Filho GB, Moura AS, Brandão PR, Schmidt HG, Mamede S. Effects of deliberate reflection on diagnostic accuracy, confidence and diagnostic calibration in dermatology. *Perspectives on Medical Education*. 2019 Aug 1;8:230-6.
66. Benvenuto-Andrade C, Dusza SW, Hay JL, Agero AL, Halpern AC, Kopf AW, Marghoob AA. Level of confidence in diagnosis: clinical examination versus dermoscopy examination. *Dermatologic surgery*. 2006 May 1;32(5):738-44.
67. Kuhn J, Mamede S, van den Berg P, Zwaan L, van Peet P, Bindels P, van Gog T. Learning deliberate reflection in medical diagnosis: does learning-by-teaching help?. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*. 2023 Mar;28(1):13-26.
68. Heller RF, Saltzstein HD, Caspe WB. Heuristics in medical and non-medical decision-making. [The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A](#). 1992 Feb;44(2):211-35.
69. Gruppen LD, Wolf FM, Billi JE. Information gathering and integration as sources of error in diagnostic decision making. [Medical Decision Making](#). 1991 Dec;11(4):233-9.
70. Ben-Assuli O, Sagi D, Leshno M, Ironi A, Ziv A. Improving diagnostic accuracy using EHR in emergency departments: A simulation-based study. [Journal of biomedical informatics](#). 2015 Jun 1;55:31-40.
71. Tio RA, Carvalho Filho MA, de Menezes Mota MF, Santanche A, Mamede S. The Effect of Information Presentation Order on Residents' Diagnostic Accuracy of Online



- 820 Simulated Patients With Chest Pain. [Journal of graduate medical education](#). 2022  
821 Aug 1;14(4):475-81.
- 822 72. Fawver B, Thomas JL, Drew T, Mills MK, Auffermann WF, Lohse KR, Williams AM.  
823 Seeing isn't necessarily believing: Misleading contextual information influences  
824 perceptual-cognitive bias in radiologists. [Journal of Experimental Psychology:  
825 Applied](#). 2020 Dec;26(4):579.
- 826 73. Levin PD, Idrees S, Sprung CL, Weissman C, Weiss Y, Moses AE, Benenson S.  
827 Antimicrobial use in the ICU: indications and accuracy—an observational trial.  
828 [Journal of hospital medicine](#). 2012 Nov;7(9):672-8.
- 829 74. Calman NS, Hyman RB, Licht W. Variability in consultation rates and practitioner  
830 level of diagnostic certainty. [J Fam Pract](#). 1992 Jul 1;35(1):31-8.
- 831 75. Krupat E, Wormwood J, Schwartzstein RM, Richards JB. Avoiding premature closure  
832 and reaching diagnostic accuracy: some key predictive factors. *Medical education*.  
833 2017 Nov;51(11):1127-37.
- 834 76. Hageman MG, Bossen JK, King JD, Ring D. Surgeon confidence in an outpatient  
835 setting. [Hand](#). 2013 Dec;8(4):430-3.
- 836 77. Thorlacius-Ussing G, Bruun M, Gjerum L, Frederiksen KS, Rhodius-Meester HF, Van  
837 Der Flier WM, Waldemar G, Hasselbalch SG. Comparing a single clinician versus a  
838 multidisciplinary consensus conference approach for dementia diagnostics. *Journal  
839 of Alzheimer's Disease*. 2021 Jan 1;83(2):741-51.
- 840 78. Hémon B, Michinov E, Guy D, Mancheron P, Scipion A. Speaking up about errors in  
841 routine clinical practice: a simulation-based intervention with nursing students.  
842 *Clinical Simulation in Nursing*. 2020 Aug 1;45:32-41.
- 843 79. Kostopoulou O, Delaney BC, Munro CW. Diagnostic difficulty and error in primary  
844 care—a systematic review. *Family practice*. 2008 Dec 1;25(6):400-13.
- 845 80. Graber ML, Kissam S, Payne VL, Meyer AN, Sorensen A, Lenfestey N, Tant E,  
846 Henriksen K, LaBresh K, Singh H. Cognitive interventions to reduce diagnostic error: a  
847 narrative review. *BMJ quality & safety*. 2012 Jul 1;21(7):535-57.
- 848 81. Saposnik G, Redelmeier D, Ruff CC, Tobler PN. Cognitive biases associated with  
849 medical decisions: a systematic review. *BMC medical informatics and decision  
850 making*. 2016 Dec;16:1-4.
- 851 82. Hall KH. Reviewing intuitive decision-making and uncertainty: the implications for  
852 medical education. *Medical education*. 2002 Mar;36(3):216-24.
- 853 83. Bhise V, Rajan SS, Sittig DF, Morgan RO, Chaudhary P, Singh H. Defining and  
854 measuring diagnostic uncertainty in medicine: a systematic review. *Journal of  
855 general internal medicine*. 2018 Jan;33:103-15.
- 856 84. Wears RL. Diagnosing diagnosis. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*. 2014 Dec  
857 1;64(6):586-7.
- 858 85. Thompson C, Cullum N, McCaughan D, Sheldon T, Raynor P. Nurses, information use,  
859 and clinical decision making—the real world potential for evidence-based decisions  
860 in nursing. *Evidence-based nursing*. 2004 Jul 1;7(3):68-72.
- 861 86. Dunlosky J. Strengthening the student toolbox: Study strategies to boost learning.  
862 *American Educator*. 2013;37(3):12-21.
- 863 87. Putnam AL, Sungkhasettee VW, Roediger III HL. Optimizing learning in college: Tips  
864 from cognitive psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. 2016  
865 Sep;11(5):652-60.

88. Heereman J, Walla P. Stress, uncertainty and decision confidence. *Applied psychophysiology and biofeedback*. 2011 Dec;36:273-9.
89. The state of Medical Education and practice in the UK - GMC. Available at: <https://www.gmc-uk.org/about/what-we-do-and-why/data-and-research/the-state-of-medical-education-and-practice-in-the-uk> (Accessed: 06 September 2024).
90. Coderre S, Mandin HH, Harasym PH, Fick GH. Diagnostic reasoning strategies and diagnostic success. *Medical education*. 2003 Aug;37(8):695-703.
91. Schmidt E, Goldhaber-Fiebert SN, Ho LA, McDonald KM. Simulation exercises as a patient safety strategy: a systematic review. *Annals of internal medicine*. 2013 Mar 5;158(5\_Part\_2):426-32.
92. Jans C, Bogossian F, Andersen P, Levett-Jones T. Examining the impact of virtual reality on clinical decision making—An integrative review. *Nurse Education Today*. 2023 Jun 1;125:105767.
93. Mahmoodi A, Bang D, Olsen K, Zhao YA, Shi Z, Broberg K, Safavi S, Han S, Nili Ahmadabadi M, Frith CD, Roepstorff A. Equality bias impairs collective decision-making across cultures. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2015 Mar 24;112(12):3835-40.
94. Stasser G, Titus W. Pooling of unshared information in group decision making: Biased information sampling during discussion. *Journal of personality and social psychology*. 1985 Jun;48(6):1467.
95. Price T, Tenan M, Head J, Maslin W, LaFiandra M. Acute stress causes over confidence in situation awareness. In 2016 IEEE International Multi-Disciplinary Conference on Cognitive Methods in Situation Awareness and Decision Support (CogSIMA) 2016 Mar 21 (pp. 1-6). IEEE.
96. Ais J, Zylberberg A, Barttfeld P, Sigman M. Individual consistency in the accuracy and distribution of confidence judgments. *Cognition*. 2016 Jan 1;146:377-86.
97. Navajas J, Hindocha C, Foda H, Keramati M, Latham PE, Bahrami B. The idiosyncratic nature of confidence. *Nature human behaviour*. 2017 Nov;1(11):810-8.