

SUBMISSION TITLE:

Balancing Tradition and Innovation: Rethinking the Dichotomy in Anatomy Teaching

Authors:

Author name	Institution	Is corresponding
Dr. Marina Čavka	University of Zagreb School of Medicine	No
Prof. Zdravko Petanjek	University of Zagreb, School of Medicine	No
Dr. Maura Zanze Beader	University of Zagreb School of Medicine	No
Dr. Thomas Mathew	University of Cambridge	No
Prof. Cecilia Brassett	University of Cambridge	No
Prof. Andreas Nagy	-	No
Prof. Ana Hladnik	University of Zagreb School of Medicine	Yes

Funding sources:

Acknowledgement:

This research was supported by the European Commission ERASMUS + Project No. 2021-1-HU01-KA220-HED-000027542 (LEAN in Medical Education: Reaching for Quality Management Tools to Teach Human Anatomy Effectively in a Multicultural and Multilingual Space). The work of MČ, MZB, AH and ZP was also supported by Croatian Science Foundation Grant No. IP-2022-10-8493 (Uniqueness in development of interneurons in human prefrontal cortex during fetal life and first postnatal year—implications in pathogenesis of schizophrenia and autism).

SUBMISSION TITLE:

Balancing Tradition and Innovation: Rethinking the Dichotomy in Anatomy Teaching

Abstract:

In response to evolving healthcare demands, technological advancements, and emerging research in biomedical and education sciences, medical education has undergone significant reform. Anatomy, a core component of medical education, has seen notable changes in teaching methods, with traditional cadaveric dissection being increasingly replaced by digital and hybrid alternatives. Despite research indicating no significant difference in short-term knowledge retention between cadaveric dissection and alternative methods, dissection uniquely fosters professionalism, empathy, and ethical awareness — traits essential for holistic medical education. This review critically examines the dichotomy between traditional and innovative teaching methods in anatomy education, questioning the assumption that traditional methods hinder progress in modern healthcare. The findings suggest that changes in medical education are primarily influenced by organizational issues, which frequently result in incomplete or insufficient adoption of new teaching approaches. This inconsistency in both application and definition makes it difficult to compare and assess their effectiveness, highlighting the necessity for randomized controlled trials and longitudinal studies in this field. Rather than discarding traditional approaches, integrating them with technological tools and emerging pedagogical approaches may offer a balanced, effective framework for developing future doctors' technical skills and humanistic qualities.

Keywords:

anatomy teaching, cadaver dissection, COVID-19, digital technology, holistic learning, medical education, professionalism, teaching traditions

1 **Title:**

2 Balancing Tradition and Innovation: Rethinking the Dichotomy in Anatomy Teaching

3

4 **Abstract**

5 In response to evolving healthcare demands, technological advancements, and emerging research in
6 biomedical and education sciences, medical education has undergone significant reform.
7 Anatomy, a core component of medical education, has seen notable changes in teaching methods,
8 with traditional cadaveric dissection being increasingly replaced by digital and hybrid alternatives.
9 Despite research indicating no significant difference in short-term knowledge retention between
10 cadaveric dissection and alternative methods, dissection uniquely fosters professionalism, empathy,
11 and ethical awareness — traits essential for holistic medical education.

12 This review critically examines the dichotomy between traditional and innovative teaching methods
13 in anatomy education, questioning the assumption that traditional methods hinder progress in
14 modern healthcare. The findings suggest that changes in medical education are primarily influenced
15 by organizational issues, which frequently result in incomplete or insufficient adoption of new
16 teaching approaches. This inconsistency in both application and definition makes it difficult to
17 compare and assess their effectiveness, highlighting the necessity for randomized controlled trials
18 and longitudinal studies in this field.

19 Rather than discarding traditional approaches, integrating them with technological tools and
20 emerging pedagogical approaches may offer a balanced, effective framework for developing future
21 doctors' technical skills and humanistic qualities.

22

23 **Keywords:** anatomy teaching, cadaver dissection, COVID-19, digital technology, holistic learning,
24 medical education, professionalism, teaching traditions

25

1 Introduction

2 Over the past century, changes in health policy priorities, and an increased need for healthcare
3 professionals, along with unprecedented technological innovation and emerging research in
4 biomedical and education sciences, has led to the constant evolution of medical education (Densen,
5 2011; Thoma et al., 2023). As enhancing the quality of medical education has always been of key
6 importance, the transformative changes in recent decades have raised questions about the impact of
7 innovations in teaching methods and curriculum reforms on the professional development of future
8 doctors. Are there elements of traditional anatomy teaching that are essential and cannot be
9 eliminated without significant loss of quality or prestige?

10 Initiated through the LEANBODY project (*LEAN in Medical Education*, 2021), this review aimed to
11 explore these issues through the perspective of anatomy — a fundamental component of medical
12 curricula globally and a subject that has been significantly influenced by changes in course structure
13 and teaching methods (Jalali et al., 2020). We started by examining the underlying causes of these
14 changes, which should ideally be guided by research evidence and tailored to meet specific societal
15 needs. The World Federation for Medical Education (WFME) recognizes that social factors often
16 shape medical education more than the results arising from research. To address this, its global
17 standards for quality improvement encompass broad areas such as student support and curriculum
18 development but without mandating specific methods, thus allowing institutions to adapt the
19 guidelines to their unique cultures, resources, and goals (*World Federation for Medical Education |*
20 *Enhancing Quality Worldwide*, 2017). However, increasing organizational challenges often prompt
21 changes that can compromise educational quality. For example, factors such as the shortening of
22 courses (Samarakoon et al., 2016), increasing student enrolment (Abualadas & Xu, 2023), the lack of
23 qualified anatomists, decreased funding and limited access to cadavers (McMenamin et al., 2014)
24 have all contributed to the declining role of traditional cadaveric dissection in many anatomy
25 programs. A meta-analysis found that student performance on knowledge-based exams was
26 comparable, regardless of whether students had engaged in cadaveric dissection or learnt anatomy
27 through alternative methods such as prosection, digital media, models, or hybrid approaches (Wilson
28 et al., 2018). However, while building a strong foundation of basic knowledge is essential in preparing
29 students for clinical practice, the ultimate goal of medical education extends beyond short-term
30 knowledge retention and academic performance. It is the development of competency across
31 various professional domains that truly defines their readiness for the demands of their future
32 careers in medicine. In this context, some researchers have raised concerns about the potential loss
33 of unique benefits associated with cadaveric dissection, especially the "hidden curriculum" that
34 fosters non-technical skills such as professionalism, empathy, and ethical awareness (Wu et al.,
35 2022).

36 Therefore, one of the specific aims of this review was to critically evaluate the perspective that
37 traditional didactic methods in medical education, particularly in anatomy teaching, are ineffective
38 and hinder progress in meeting the challenges of global healthcare in the 21st century (Majumder et
39 al., 2023). This viewpoint argues that traditional methods should be replaced by innovative
40 educational approaches to better prepare students for the complexities of modern medical practice.
41 Through this review, we aimed to assess whether these claims are substantiated by evidence and to
42 explore whether a balance between traditional and innovative methods might provide the most
43 effective framework for medical education.

44

45

1

2 **The Long History of Anatomy: What is Traditional Anatomy Teaching?**

3 As evident from the etymology of the word “anatomy,” which is derived from the Greek, *anatome*
4 meaning “to cut” or “to cut repeatedly” (Malomo et al., 2006), dissection has been an integral part
5 of anatomy teaching throughout history. Dissection typically followed theoretical instruction,
6 offering students a hands-on, immersive experience where they could observe the organization of
7 the human body and appreciate the texture of tissues (Dissabandara et al., 2015). This method also
8 allowed students to understand the relationships between anatomical structures, recognize
9 anatomical variations, and develop the necessary technical skills that are essential for their future
10 professional practice (Ghazanfar et al., 2018).

11 A “traditional” anatomy course is typically described as being delivered through in-person lectures,
12 studying from anatomy textbooks, and performing hands-on cadaveric dissection in the laboratory
13 (Abualadas & Xu, 2023). All these combine to enable medical students to achieve their learning
14 objectives by gaining a detailed and comprehensive understanding of the structure of the human
15 body (Suárez-Escudero et al., 2020)

16 Traditional lectures help students to develop a theoretical foundation for understanding anatomy,
17 and offer the context for what they will observe in cadaveric dissection. These lectures primarily
18 focus on transmitting knowledge from the lecturer to the students (Bell et al., 2019), where the
19 lecturer describes anatomical structures as well as explaining their functional and clinical
20 significance (Turney, 2007).

21 Therefore, traditional teaching is often associated with passive learning, whereas modern curricula
22 are increasingly moving toward active learning and teaching strategies that focus on student-driven
23 knowledge construction, such as flipped classrooms, problem-based learning and team-based
24 learning (Singh et al., 2019).

25 Moreover, traditional, topic-based curricula primarily focus on delineating the content that educators
26 are expected to teach, whereas constructive alignment has now become a crucial aspect of quality
27 assessment. This approach, as a form of outcomes-based teaching and learning, ensures that both
28 instructional strategies and assessments are connected to the intended learning outcomes, which
29 specify what students are expected to do with the knowledge they acquire (Biggs & Tang, 2015).

30 However, when assessing the effectiveness of traditional methods in anatomy education, it is
31 important to consider the historical and contextual factors surrounding their use and development .
32 Before the mid-20th century, access to educational resources such as textbooks and anatomical
33 atlases was quite limited. As a result, lectures became the main source of anatomical knowledge for
34 students, while prosections and cadavers were the primary tools for visualizing three-dimensional
35 structures. The lack of technological resources required students to adopt a more proactive and self-
36 directed approach to learning, encouraging a strong sense of initiative. Since atlases were not readily
37 available, students often collaborated in small groups, which facilitated teamwork and peer learning.
38 In many medical schools, practical work was assessed periodically throughout the term, providing
39 students with ongoing feedback on their understanding and highlighting areas needing
40 improvement. Passing these assessments was often a requirement for continuing with dissection.

41 Over time, the hands-on approach evolved to include a broader range of active learning methods,
42 such as peer learning and reflective discussions. With increased availability of practical materials and
43 reducing lecture time, these strategies encouraged students to engage directly with the material and

1 learn from each other, often in small groups, effectively blurring the lines between traditional and
2 modern educational practices. (Hildebrandt, 2010). Therefore, concepts such as peer-teaching and
3 active learning are not recent innovations; they have origins in the 19th century and have been
4 further enriched by technological advancements in anatomical education (Sugand et al., 2010).
5 Interestingly, recent research indicates that traditional lectures are adaptable and can be effectively
6 integrated into a student-centred unit design that is both research-informed and evidence-based.
7 This suggests that creating a dichotomy between traditional lectures and active learning is
8 misguided, as it hinders a nuanced exploration of the full range of possibilities and generates bias in
9 research agendas (Dietrich et al., 2022).

10 This division risks creating an either-or scenario that overlooks the strengths of different approaches.
11 For instance, cadaveric dissection, a hallmark of traditional anatomy education, is often reduced to
12 merely a method of teaching detailed structural knowledge. However, this focus on the cognitive
13 domain seriously overlooks its broader educational value, such as fostering professionalism,
14 empathy, and ethical awareness in the affective domain. By framing the debate as traditional versus
15 modern, we risk losing valuable pedagogical tools from the traditional model that contribute to the
16 holistic development of medical students.

17

18

19

20

1 **Technological Advances in Anatomy Education: Lessons Learned from the COVID-19** 2 **Pandemic**

3 Increasing technological advances have led to the introduction of numerous digital tools such as
4 virtual cadaveric dissection, online 3D models and videos into anatomy classrooms (Abualadas & Xu,
5 2023), offering alternatives to traditional face-to-face teaching methods.

6 However, while such digital tools provide new ways for students to engage with the material, they
7 also bring challenges, in particular cognitive overload. This occurs when the learning environment
8 presents more information than the brain can effectively process and retain at the same time.
9 Anatomy is inherently complex, requiring students to integrate their knowledge of systems,
10 structures, and clinical relevance. When advanced technology is not managed appropriately, it can
11 overwhelm students and exceed their cognitive limits, especially when they are trying to learn basic
12 anatomy and simultaneously navigating a new tools interface (Touliopoulos et al., 2022). There is also
13 the risk of passive learning behaviours, such as rewatching video lectures or merely browsing
14 through slides without actively engaging with the content.

15 In addition, many novel digital tools do not allow or encourage students to work in a team. Most
16 virtual reality (VR) modalities are only designed for a single user, which contrasts starkly with
17 situations arising in a healthcare setting. As good teamwork is a key factor in the success of
18 healthcare management. The use of modalities such as virtual worlds to create scenarios that require
19 teamwork and communication should be more widely explored (Jiang et al., 2022).

20 Reported negative feedback from online learners, such as screen fatigue and isolation, highlight the
21 importance of addressing these challenges with targeted interventions and strategies to improve the
22 quality and effectiveness of online education (Abualadas & Xu, 2023; Rahmani et al., 2024). As the
23 logistics of organizing cadaveric dissection remain a significant challenge, emerging digital tools for
24 3D visualization of the human body offer promising alternatives for learning anatomical structures
25 and developing manual skills (Adnan & Xiao, 2023). Although the COVID-19 pandemic posed major
26 challenges for educational organization in recent years, it also provided an opportunity to assess and
27 compare online with in-person classes.

28 The recency of the pandemic has meant that currently available research in this area is mostly
29 supported with evidence from students' academic performance and satisfaction rates, while
30 longitudinal data on the long-term effects of different teaching models on learning outcomes are still
31 lacking. Nonetheless, important implications for the future can be drawn from the recent literature.

32 The systematic review compared the educational effectiveness of online anatomy teaching and
33 traditional ("face-to-face") teaching methods, showing comparable academic performance with no
34 statistical difference between the two teaching methods. However, students reported a higher level
35 of satisfaction with face-to-face teaching (Abualadas & Xu, 2023).

36 The finding that a multi-modal learning approach that combines online with face-to-face educational
37 modalities for medical students could be efficient and successful (Abualadas & Xu, 2023; Papa et al.,
38 2022) is especially interesting with regard to the logistical challenges of course organization for a
39 large number of students and the future of hybrid courses (Banovac et al., 2023). Nevertheless, the
40 vast majority of undergraduate students found anatomical dissection and practical work in general
41 to be the most important aspect of teaching, which, in their opinion, could not be replaced by online
42 learning (Banovac et al., 2021). Interestingly, current research redirects the debate from cadaveric
43 dissection as one of the anatomy teaching tools to its importance in developing professionalism of
44 future doctors. While this had been recognized in previous educational research, it was extensively

1 revisited during the COVID-19 pandemic, as many medical schools that had used in-person cadaveric
2 dissection were forced to abandon it. Direct involvement with dissection during undergraduate
3 training, besides learning anatomical knowledge , also provides students with an opportunity to
4 practice and refine non-technical skills, such as communication and collaboration, while
5 simultaneously promoting the development and formation of their professional identity (Brassett et
6 al., 2021; MacPherson & Lisk, 2022).

7 Courses that are well-designed and balance technological tools with traditional practices can provide
8 a comprehensive framework for anatomy education, fostering both technical skills and essential
9 humanistic qualities in medical students. The gradual, progressive introduction of technology
10 alongside hands-on learning and collaborative experiences can maintain student engagement and
11 reinforce learning without causing cognitive overload. As most schools have transitioned from a
12 purely traditional cadaver-based curriculum to adopting more interactive, custom-made approaches
13 that better suit the learning strategies of new generations, more specific research is required into the
14 best ways of integrating digital tools into the anatomy course.

15

16

1 **Emerging Pedagogies in Anatomy Education: The Roles of Students and Teachers**

2 With the rapid expansion of medical knowledge, a debate has arisen regarding the extent to which
3 anatomy should be taught, emphasizing a clinical anatomy model that focuses on students as future
4 healthcare professionals rather than anatomists (Suárez-Escudero et al., 2020).

5 In a time of heightened accountability in the education profession, teachers are responsible for
6 ensuring that all graduates are fully prepared for practice. Consequently, competency-based medical
7 education (CBME) has become a key focus for medical education planners, outlining essential
8 competencies for graduates and ensuring these are taught, assessed, and acquired (Frank et al.,
9 2010).

10 CBME advocates favour a curriculum organized around competencies rather than extensive lists of
11 knowledge objectives. They argue that objective-based methods often overemphasize knowledge,
12 neglecting skills, attitudes, and the integration of knowledge necessary for medical practice (Frank et
13 al., 2010). As a result, many schools are shortening the length of their anatomy courses, with some
14 institutions adopting more integrated curricula and moving away from standalone anatomy courses
15 (Husmann, Gibson, & Davis, 2020). The shortage of qualified educators in pre-clinical disciplines has
16 also influenced the transition toward integrated curricula, as clinicians are often recruited to teach
17 these subjects on medical courses.

18 While Competency-Based Medical Education (CBME) was introduced as an effective response to the
19 organizational challenges and demands of contemporary medical education, its inherently practical
20 focus may lead to the exclusion of content or experiences that do not directly contribute to program
21 outcomes. This approach risks reductionism, potentially causing learners to concentrate more on
22 achieving milestones rather than pursuing excellence (Frank et al., 2010). Nonetheless, frameworks
23 such as the CanMEDS Physician Competency Framework aim to align physician competencies with
24 societal needs, defining exceptionally high standards for physician competencies, which include
25 being a medical expert, communicator, collaborator, health advocate, lifelong learner, manager,
26 scholar (Thoma et al., 2023).

27 The traditional placement of gross anatomy education at the start of medical training, which
28 provides a foundation for clinical practice (Turney, 2007), raises questions about the optimal timing
29 for delivering anatomy courses in the context of CBME. Cognitive neuroscience shows that
30 adolescence is a period of significant brain development, with many functions maturing into the mid-
31 20s, aligning with the typical age of students entering higher education (Petanjek et al., 2011). This
32 suggests that early exposure to anatomy may still be relevant, despite the shift toward integrated
33 curricula. Therefore, while CBME emphasizes practical outcomes and societal needs, maintaining
34 foundational subjects like anatomy early in medical education could support comprehensive
35 development and ensure that learners are well-prepared for clinical practice.

36 Historical figures in anatomy education, such as Franklin Paine Mall and Drago Perović, emphasized
37 the significance of anatomical institutes and early exposure to the scientific method (Dolinar, 1969;
38 Hildebrandt, 2010). They also highlighted the importance of interpersonal relationships between
39 students and teachers in forming professional attitudes (Martin et al., 2002). This supports the idea
40 that traditional anatomy education in the first year of medical training can benefit students by
41 introducing them to the scientific and professional aspects of medicine during a critical period of
42 cognitive maturation.

43

1 However, adapting educational approaches to meet the needs of Generation Z students, who have
2 grown up in a technology-driven world, is essential (Romero Reveron, 2020). Generation Z's unique
3 expectations and learning styles align well with student-centred pedagogies. While emerging
4 methods like flipped classrooms and problem-based learning (PBL) have certain advantages,
5 randomized controlled trials are required to validate their effectiveness. Variability in PBL
6 implementation and students' learning habits complicate the evaluation of this method (Zheng et al.,
7 2023). Similarly, high heterogeneity in flipped classroom formats with varied instructor
8 implementations presents limitations in the research. In addition, addressing publication bias is
9 crucial for obtaining reliable results (Cui et al., 2023). The hidden curriculum, although not well-
10 defined, plays a crucial role in medical education by promoting professional development in areas
11 such as ethical mindsets and social skills. However, the problem of the hidden curriculum has not
12 been solved by the transition from a teacher-centred education to a student-centred educational
13 model that takes the student's experience as the starting point of learning. On the contrary, some
14 authors propose that the hidden curriculum can be made explicit in higher education when the
15 teacher recognizes and lives out their teaching; and that the student's experience of the learning
16 process is not merely an individual one, but emerges through their interpersonal relationship with
17 the teacher (Orón Semper & Blasco, 2018).

18 Therefore, educators must understand cognitive development and adapt their pedagogical methods
19 in order to address the needs of the current generation of students. Nonetheless, the traditional role
20 of teachers remains important, as role modelling plays a significant role in developing medical
21 students' professional identities and sense of belonging (Spaans et al., 2023). Strategically integrating
22 anatomy education within medical curricula is essential for supporting both foundational knowledge
23 and the development of professional competencies. When planning an anatomy course that includes
24 dissection as a learning tool, it is important for educators to recognize that the learning experience is
25 not uniform and that participants may require diverse learning tools (Winkelmann, 2007).

26

27 **Conclusion**

28 The findings elaborated in this manuscript demonstrate a consistent aim throughout the history of
29 medical education to improve the quality of anatomy teaching by evolving pedagogical techniques
30 and addressing organizational challenges and societal needs. We conclude that it is challenging to
31 distinguish between traditional and modern methods of teaching anatomy. Therefore, the shift
32 towards modern methods should be seen as part of a continuum to improve teaching strategies,
33 rather than a stark division between traditional and modern approaches.

34 Although research in this field is evolving, new generations of medical students continue to require
35 the best possible education during their formative years. In our view, traditional didactic methods are
36 still capable of addressing the challenges of the healthcare system in the 21st century. The
37 maintenance of traditional detail-oriented anatomy teaching through cadaveric dissection adds
38 value to medical education as it fosters personal and professional growth in future doctors by
39 immersing them in a learning environment that promotes both technical expertise and humanistic
40 qualities. Instead of abandoning traditional methods, integrating them with technological tools and
41 emerging pedagogical approaches may offer a balanced, effective framework for quality professional
42 development of future doctors.

43

44

1 **References**

- 2 Abualadas, H. M., & Xu, L. (2023). Achievement of learning outcomes in non-traditional
3 (online) versus traditional (face-to-face) anatomy teaching in medical schools: A
4 mixed method systematic review. *Clinical Anatomy (New York, N.Y.)*, 36(1), 50–76.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ca.23942>
- 6 Adnan, S., & Xiao, J. (2023). A scoping review on the trends of digital anatomy education.
7 *Clinical Anatomy (New York, N.Y.)*, 36(3), 471–491. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ca.23995>
- 8 Banovac, I., Katavić, V., Blažević, A., Bičanić, I., Hladnik, A., Kovačić, N., & Petanjek, Z. (2021).
9 The anatomy lesson of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic: Irreplaceable tradition (cadaver
10 work) and new didactics of digital technology. *Croatian Medical Journal*, 62(2), 173–
11 186. <https://doi.org/10.3325/cmj.2021.62.173>
- 12 Banovac, I., Kovačić, N., Hladnik, A., Blažević, A., Bičanić, I., Petanjek, Z., & Katavić, V. (2023).
13 In the eye of the beholder—How course delivery affects anatomy education. *Annals*
14 *of Anatomy = Anatomischer Anzeiger: Official Organ of the Anatomische Gesellschaft*,
15 246, 152043. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aanat.2022.152043>
- 16 Bell, F. E., Neuffer, F. H., Haddad, T. R., Epps, J. C., Kozik, M. E., & Warren, B. C. (2019). Active
17 Learning of the Floor of Mouth Anatomy with Ultrasound. *Anatomical Sciences*
18 *Education*, 12(3), 310–316. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ase.1839>
- 19 Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2015). Constructive Alignment: An Outcomes-Based Approach to
20 Teaching Anatomy. In L. K. Chan & W. Pawlina (Eds.), *Teaching Anatomy: A Practical*
21 *Guide* (pp. 31–38). Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3->
22 [319-08930-0_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-08930-0_4)

- 1 Brassett, C., Chilvers, N., Lloyd, R. G. C., Fletcher, P., Fay, I. H. H., Spear, M., & Taylor, H. L.
2 (2021). *Maintaining cadaveric dissection in the COVID era: New perspectives in*
3 *anatomy teaching and medical education*. <https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.64932>
- 4 Densen, P. (2011). Challenges and Opportunities Facing Medical Education. *Transactions of*
5 *the American Clinical and Climatological Association*, 122, 48–58.
- 6 Dietrich, H., Evans, T., Dietrich, H., & Evans, T. (2022). Traditional lectures versus active
7 learning – A false dichotomy? *STEM Education*, 2(4), Article 2767-1925_2022_4_275.
8 <https://doi.org/10.3934/steme.2022017>
- 9 Dissabandara, L. O., Nirthanan, S. N., Khoo, T. K., & Tedman, R. (2015). Role of cadaveric
10 dissections in modern medical curricula: A study on student perceptions. *Anatomy &*
11 *Cell Biology*, 48(3), 205–212. <https://doi.org/10.5115/acb.2015.48.3.205>
- 12 Dolinar, Z. J. (1969). [In memoriam Prof. Dr. Med. Drago Perović (1888-1968)]. *Acta*
13 *Anatomica*, 73(1), 1–3.
- 14 Ghazanfar, H., Rashid, S., Hussain, A., Ghazanfar, M., Ghazanfar, A., & Javaid, A. (2018).
15 Cadaveric Dissection a Thing of the Past? The Insight of Consultants, Fellows, and
16 Residents. *Cureus*, 10(4), e2418. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.2418>
- 17 Hildebrandt, S. (2010). Lessons to be learned from the history of anatomical teaching in the
18 United States: The example of the University of Michigan. *Anatomical Sciences*
19 *Education*, 3(4), 202–212. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ase.166>
- 20 Jiang, H., Vimalasvaran, S., Wang, J. K., Lim, K. B., Mogali, S. R., & Car, L. T. (2022). Virtual
21 Reality in Medical Students' Education: Scoping Review. *JMIR Medical Education*,
22 8(1), e34860. <https://doi.org/10.2196/34860>
- 23 *LEAN in Medical Education: Reaching for Quality Management Tools to Teach Human*
24 *Anatomy Effectively in a Multicultural and Multilingual Learning Space*. (2021).

1 <https://erasmus-plus.ec.europa.eu/projects/search/details/2021-1-HU01-KA220->
2 HED-000027542

3 MacPherson, E., & Lisk, K. (2022). The value of in-person undergraduate dissection in
4 anatomical education in the time of Covid-19. *Anatomical Sciences Education*, 15(4),
5 797–802. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ase.2186>

6 Majumder, M. A. A., Haque, M., & Razzaque, M. S. (2023). Editorial: Trends and challenges of
7 medical education in the changing academic and public health environment of the
8 21st century. *Frontiers in Communication*, 8.
9 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2023.1153764>

10 Malomo, A., Idowu, O., & Osuagwu, F. (2006). Lessons from History: Human Anatomy, from
11 the Origin to the Renaissance. *International Journal of Morphology*, 24.
12 <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0717-95022006000100018>

13 Martin, J., Lloyd, M., & Singh, S. (2002). Professional attitudes: Can they be taught and
14 assessed in medical education? *Clinical Medicine (London, England)*, 2, 217–223.
15 <https://doi.org/10.7861/clinmedicine.2-3-217>

16 McMenamin, P. G., Quayle, M. R., McHenry, C. R., & Adams, J. W. (2014). The production of
17 anatomical teaching resources using three-dimensional (3D) printing technology.
18 *Anatomical Sciences Education*, 7(6), 479–486. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ase.1475>

19 Orón Semper, J. V., & Blasco, M. (2018). Revealing the Hidden Curriculum in Higher
20 Education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 37(5), 481–498.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-018-9608-5>

22 Papa, V., Varotto, E., Galli, M., Vaccarezza, M., & Galassi, F. M. (2022). One year of anatomy
23 teaching and learning in the outbreak: Has the Covid-19 pandemic marked the end of

1 a century-old practice? A systematic review. *Anatomical Sciences Education*, 15(2),
2 261–280. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ase.2162>

3 Petanjek, Z., Judaš, M., Šimic, G., Rasin, M. R., Uylings, H. B. M., Rakic, P., & Kostovic, I.
4 (2011). Extraordinary neoteny of synaptic spines in the human prefrontal cortex.
5 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*,
6 108(32), 13281–13286. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1105108108>

7 Rahmani, A. M., Groot, W., & Rahmani, H. (2024). Dropout in online higher education: A
8 systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in*
9 *Higher Education*, 21(1), 19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00450-9>

10 Romero Reveron, R. (2020). Human anatomy in the G=generation Z's medical studies. *MOJ*
11 *Anatomy & Physiology*, 7, 12–13. <https://doi.org/10.15406/mojap.2020.07.00281>

12 Samarakoon, L. B., Vithoosan, S., Kokulan, S., Dissanayake, M. M., Anthony, D. J.,
13 Dissanayake, V., & Jayasekara, R. (2016). Anatomy of Teaching Anatomy: Do
14 Prosected Cross Sections Improve Students Understanding of Spatial and Radiological
15 Anatomy? *Anatomy Research International*, 2016, 8984704.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/8984704>

17 Singh, K., Bharatha, A., Sa, B., Adams, O. P., & Majumder, M. A. A. (2019). Teaching anatomy
18 using an active and engaging learning strategy. *BMC Medical Education*, 19(1), 149.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-019-1590-2>

20 Spaans, I., de Kleijn, R., Seeleman, C., & Dilaver, G. (2023). ‘A role model is like a mosaic’:
21 Reimagining URiM students’ role models in medical school. *BMC Medical Education*,
22 23(1), 396. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-023-04394-y>

23 Suárez-Escudero, J. C., Posada-Jurado, M. C., Bedoya-Muñoz, L. J., Urbina-Sánchez, A. J.,
24 Ferreira-Morales, J. L., & Bohórquez-Gutiérrez, C. A. (2020). Teaching and learning

1 anatomy. Pedagogical methods, history, the present and tendencies. *Acta Medica*
2 *Colombiana*, 45(4), 48–55. <https://doi.org/10.36104/amc.2020.1898>

3 Sugand, K., Abrahams, P., & Khurana, A. (2010). The anatomy of anatomy: A review for its
4 modernization. *Anatomical Sciences Education*, 3(2), 83–93.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ase.139>

6 Thoma, B., Abbott, C., & Snell, L. (2023). The future of the CanMEDS physician competency
7 framework. *Canadian Medical Education Journal*, 14(1), 1–3.
8 <https://doi.org/10.36834/cmej.77098>

9 Touliopoulos, E., Ives, R., Chan, S., Lohit, S., Reis, I., Sinha, S., Nehru, A., DeYoung, V.,
10 Mitchell, J., Brewer-Deluce, D., Sonnadara, R., & Wainman, B. (2022). The Cognitive
11 Load of Learning Anatomy in a Virtual World. In *The FASEB Journal* (Vol. 36).
12 <https://doi.org/10.1096/fasebj.2022.36.S1.R6184>

13 Turney, B. (2007). Anatomy in a Modern Medical Curriculum. *Annals of The Royal College of*
14 *Surgeons of England*, 89(2), 104–107. <https://doi.org/10.1308/003588407X168244>

15 Wilson, A. B., Miller, C. H., Klein, B. A., Taylor, M. A., Goodwin, M., Boyle, E. K., Brown, K.,
16 Hoppe, C., & Lazarus, M. (2018). A meta-analysis of anatomy laboratory pedagogies.
17 *Clinical Anatomy (New York, N.Y.)*, 31(1), 122–133. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ca.22934>

18 Winkelmann, A. (2007). Anatomical dissection as a teaching method in medical school: A
19 review of the evidence. *Medical Education*, 41(1), 15–22.
20 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02625.x>

21 *World Federation for Medical Education | Enhancing Quality Worldwide*. (2017, February
22 21). <https://wfme.org/>

23 Wu, A., Xiao, Q. Y., McWatt, S., Utomo, R., Talis, A., Saraci, K., Brassett, C., Sagoo, M. G.,
24 Wingate, R., Chien, C.-L., Traxler, H., Waschke, J., Vielmuth, F., Yamada, Y., Sakurai, T.,

1 Zeroual, M., Olsen, J., El-Batti, S., Viranta-Kovanen, S., ... Noël, G. P. J. C. (2022). The
2 Anatomy Course During COVID-19: The Impact of Cadaver-Based Learning on the
3 Initiation of Reflection on Death. *Medical Science Educator*, 32(5), 1033–1044.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40670-022-01609-7>

5 Zheng, Q.-M., Li, Y.-Y., Yin, Q., Zhang, N., Wang, Y.-P., Li, G.-X., & Sun, Z.-G. (2023). The
6 effectiveness of problem-based learning compared with lecture-based learning in
7 surgical education: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Medical Education*,
8 23(1), 546. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-023-04531-7>

9