## Discussion

This study of 76 medicals utilised paediatric Virtual Reality (VR) scenarios to study how medical students seek information and consider diagnostic differentials in a more naturalistic manner. Using VR software, it is possible to emulate realistic situations involving paediatric patients and record nuanced aspects of behaviour during the scenario, such as what actions are taken (including treatment) and when participants call for help from a senior member of staff. The strength in this paradigm is allowing participants to interact with patient, who can improve/deteriorate over the course of a scenario in reaction to any administered treatment. This represents a significant increase in realism relative to our previous studies, in which patient scenarios were presented and described using textual vignettes. As opposed to only textual descriptions of cases, our VR methodology provides visual (e.g. viewing scans) and audio (e.g. auscultating the patient’s lungs, speaking to the patient) information to participants about the patient. The use of high-fidelity or virtual reality simulations can be useful for emulating the time pressures (Schmidt et al., 2013, Jans et al., 2023) that clinicians contend with in daily practice (Yates, 2020), especially when simulating patients who are in deteriorating state (as in out VR scenarios). Emulating these aspects of medical practice is especially pertinent given that clinicians may behave differently in a simulation-based study compared to a paper vignette study (Yang, Thompson & Bland, 2012). Using such simulation-based methodologies is then well-suited to finding insights in medical decision making that apply to naturalistic contexts. In this section, we summarise the main findings from this VR study.

**Making Appropriate Diagnoses**

When assessing the diagnoses provided by medical students in this study, we used a score for diagnostic accuracy that took into account the range of differentials that medical students considered. We adopted this measure to assess diagnostic thinking as a whole, rather than simply identifying a focal diagnosis/condition correctly. This was important to do given that the diagnostic uncertainty came not from the focal condition, but from identifying its source and causes. We found that information seeking was predictive of differences in diagnostic appropriateness. More specifically, we found more informative/valuable history taking was associated with higher diagnostic appropriateness. There is a heuristic taught within medicine that history taking alone determines between 70% and 90% of diagnoses (Keifenheim, 2015). This would then explain why we observe the positive effect of optimal history taking on diagnostic performance. We show that with a more appropriate patient history, participants are better able to understand the patient’s condition and its possible causes. This suggests that future work and interventions could be especially effective when focused on history taking and early information seeking by clinicians. We note that with this measure, we operationalise diagnostic accuracy quite differently to our previous work (and to previous work in the extant literature), which only considered whether a single correct differential was mentioned by participants. Such a measure is analogous to real practice as clinicians may not always be able to identify a focal diagnosis, or such a task is not the central priority for their practice. Rather, their priority is on starting an appropriate treatment plan and being thorough in considering possible causes of the patient’s condition. As we noted in previous chapters however, diagnostic accuracy can be defined in many different ways. We revisit this line of discussion in the Overall Discussion section.

**Treatment as a Means of Reducing Uncertainty**

We found that final confidence was predicted by the amount of treatment administered by students. The consideration of treatment in this study is certainly an important aspect of real medical practice to emulate. When formulating a diagnosis, clinicians then use this diagnosis to guide their future treatment and care pathway. By administering treatment, both in real medical practice and in our VR scenarios, clinicians can observe the patient changing in terms of their condition. If a clinician decides to administer oxygen to the patient, they may then observe the patient’s oxygen saturation increase if successful.

We use this aspect of treatment and patient improvement to explain our overall finding in this study that differentials narrowed between the two timepoints, rather than broadening as in the previous studies. We did not replicate our finding from the both online vignette study and the think-aloud study that the initial diagnostic breadth of medical students (i.e. the number of differentials recorded during the pause point at 5 minutes in) did not predict information seeking or changes in confidence. We explain this difference as a result of the role of treatment in the VR scenario (and in wider medical practice).

The act of administering treatment and observing the patient’s reaction to this treatment is a key part of the diagnostic decisional process, as it provides clinicians with a form of feedback on their decisions. When participants could not administer treatment in the vignette studies and observe the patient’s change in condition (either improving or deteriorating), they then do not receive feedback that can be used to support or rule out diagnoses. Taken together, this provides an important consideration for future work looking at diagnostic uncertainty, in that methodologies without treatable patients (e.g textual vignettes) may result in different behaviour to how clinicians would approach such diagnoses in everyday practice. Broadening and narrowing may represent different stages of the diagnostic process, such that clinicians first broaden their differentials as they develop a diagnosis and then narrow as their chosen treatment is observed to be effective (as the patient improves). Arocha and Patel (1980) found evidence, from verbal utterances during diagnoses, of initial hypothesis generation and then narrowing of differentials based on subsequent information received (particularly for more experienced medical students).

**Confidence and its Relationship with Information Seeking**

On confidence and information seeking, we were able to look at information seeking in a more fine-grained manner in comparison to both our previous studies and past literature, due to the paradigm’s open-ended nature and greater availability of information requests, testing and treatment options in the VR scenarios. We did not find initial confidence was predicted by information seeking prior to that point. We do however find that initial confidence was positively associated with the amount of subsequent testing that medical students requested. If we intuitively consider the different stages of the diagnostic process, as we observed in Studies 2 and 3 with our vignette methodology, clinicians tend to request tests when they are honing in on a particular diagnosis and want to either confirm their beliefs or rule out an alternative diagnosis. In other words, tests tend to be performed in a hypothesis-driven way. This would explain why, with higher confidence, medical students in this study subsequently request more tests as they seek to confirm or rule out their diagnostic hypotheses. Conversely, medicals students with lower initial confidence would be less sure of which tests to request. Past work found that higher confidence was associated with a tendency to seek confirmatory evidence (Rollwage et al., 2020), and that higher confidence decreases the chance that incoming information would change one’s mind (Pescetelli et al., 2021). These papers can be used to explain our findings: once clinicians have sufficiently considered enough diagnostic hypotheses (as reflected in their higher confidence), they then use testing as confirmatory evidence to support and then narrow their differentials. The higher confidence in a clinician’s differentials before this narrowing takes place, the less susceptible they are to having their mind changed to consider other possibilities. This corresponds with the hypothetico-deductive ‘ideal’ of the diagnostic process, in which hypotheses are formulated based on patients and then further information is sought to test these hypotheses (Higgs et al., 2019). In addition, when clinicians have broadened their set of differentials, they are likely to have competing differentials, necessitating the seeking of information to reduce cognitive dissonance (Adams, 1961). This is predicated on both having access to and being able to suitably interpret incoming information in order to help narrow differentials. For instance, medical students may lack the necessary knowledge to interpret information as being contradictory of their beliefs and subsequently narrow their differentials (Arocha & Patel, 1980).

When coupled with the previous section on how broadening and narrowing of differentials may represent different parts of the diagnostic process, this could help explain the different directionalities for the relationship between information seeking and confidence. As discussed during the Introduction chapter, one can study information seeking informs subsequent confidence or how confidence informs subsequent information seeking. Firstly, information is sought to capture a wide range of differentials, with more information increasing confidence. This explains why the absolute magnitude of information (rather than the relative evidence for a particular option) increases confidence in of itself (Ko, Feuerriegel, et al., 2022). This higher confidence then, during the narrowing stage of the decision process, increases the extent to which information sampling is biased towards considered options (Kaanders et al, 2021) and confirmatory evidence for these options (Rollwage et al., 2020). As a result, during this narrowing stage, confidence decreases the follow-up information that a clinician may get (Meyer et al., 2013) as they become more selective in choosing information that helps narrow their differentials.

**Implications and Limitations**