Editorial | Journal of Orthopaedic Case Reports 2026 September:16(9):Page 10-13

Reimagining Orthopedic Practical Examinations: The Expanding Role of Objective Structured Clinical Examination

Sachin Kale[1], Mainak Roy[2], Vishal Kumar[3], Ashok Shyam[4]

Learning Point of the Article:

Understand the principles and limitations of conventional orthopaedic practical examinations. Describe the role and benefits of Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs). Identify key components of structured, competency-based assessment in orthopaedics. Recognize the role of technology in improving assessment and feedback. Appreciate the challenges and future directions of objective orthopaedic assessment.

Abstract

Introduction: Assessment of orthopedic clinical competence has traditionally relied on long-case examinations, short-case discussions, and viva voce assessments. Although these methods evaluate theoretical knowledge and bedside skills, they are often limited by examiner bias, variability in case complexity, and lack of standardization. The Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) has emerged as a structured and objective method for assessing multiple domains of orthopedic competence within a uniform examination framework.

Objective: The objective of the study is to discuss the expanding role of OSCE in orthopedic practical examinations and evaluate its educational significance, strengths, limitations, and future implications in competency-based orthopedic training.

Discussion: OSCE provides a comprehensive and standardized approach for assessing musculoskeletal examination skills, trauma management, radiological interpretation, procedural competence, communication skills, professionalism, and clinical decision-making. Through structured stations, predefined checklists, and objective scoring systems, OSCE minimizes subjectivity and improves fairness and reproducibility in assessment. Orthopedic OSCE stations commonly include joint examination, fracture assessment, implant identification, plaster application, emergency trauma scenarios, and informed consent discussions. The integration of simulation-based learning and standardized patient interactions enhances the practical relevance of the examination and better reflects real-world orthopedic practice. In addition to assessment, OSCE promotes systematic learning, active clinical reasoning, procedural proficiency, and communication skills among trainees. However, successful implementation requires considerable infrastructure, faculty training, logistical planning, and financial resources. Concerns also remain regarding checklist-oriented learning and limited evaluation of longitudinal clinical judgment.

Conclusion: OSCE represents a major advancement in orthopedic practical assessment by providing structured, objective, and competency-oriented evaluation of clinical performance. Its ability to assess multiple domains of orthopedic competence makes it an essential component of modern orthopedic education. With ongoing advances in simulation technology and digital assessment systems, OSCE is expected to play an increasingly important role in shaping future orthopedic training and improving patient-centered clinical practice.

Keywords: Objective structured clinical examination, orthopedics, practical examination, clinical competence, competency-based medical education, musculoskeletal examination, trauma assessment, procedural skills, simulation-based training, orthopedic education, clinical reasoning, communication skills.

Access this article online

Website: www.jocr.co.in

DOI: https://doi.org/10.13107/jocr.2026.v16.i09.7968

Author's Photo Gallery


Dr. Sachin Kale


Dr. Mainak Roy


Dr. Vishal Kumar


Dr. Ashok Shyam

[1]Department of Orthopaedics, Dr DY Patil School of Medicine, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India,
[2]Department of Orthopaedics, AIIMS Kalyani, West Bengal,
[3]Department of Orthopaedics, Atal Bihari Vajpayee Institute of Medical Sciences and Dr Ram Manohar Lohia Hospital, New Delhi, India,
[4]Department of Foot and Ankle Orthopaedics, PGI, Chandigarh, India.

Address of Correspondence:
Dr. Sachin Kale, Department of Orthopaedics, Dr DY Patil School of Medicine, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India,
E-mail: sachinkale@gmail.com

Submitted: 04/06/2026; Review: 15/07/2026; Accepted: August 2026; Published: September 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.13107/jocr.2026.v16.i09.7968

Dear Editor,

The assessment of clinical competence in orthopedics has undergone a significant transformation over the past few decades. Traditional practical examinations, largely dependent on long cases, short cases, and viva voce assessments, have historically served as the cornerstone of orthopedic evaluation. While these methods undoubtedly test clinical knowledge and bedside acumen, they are often influenced by examiner subjectivity, variability in patient presentations, and inconsistencies in marking patterns. In an era increasingly focused on competency-based medical education, such limitations have become difficult to ignore. Against this backdrop, the Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) has emerged as one of the most important advancements in modern orthopedic assessment [1,2].

Orthopaedics is fundamentally a specialty of precision, judgment, and technical execution. A surgeon dealing with musculoskeletal trauma or reconstructive procedures must possess not only strong theoretical knowledge but also refined examination skills, procedural competence, communication ability, and sound decision-making capacity. Conventional examinations often assess isolated components of this spectrum and may fail to provide a comprehensive picture of a trainee's actual clinical competence. The growing realization that knowledge alone does not equate to competency has driven medical educators toward more structured and skill-oriented assessment systems.

The introduction of OSCE marked a paradigm shift in the philosophy of clinical evaluation. Unlike traditional examinations that rely heavily on examiner discretion and chance-based patient allocation, OSCE uses standardized stations with predefined objectives, structured tasks, and checklist-based marking schemes. Every candidate encounters identical scenarios under uniform conditions, thereby significantly improving objectivity, fairness, and reproducibility. This standardization has particular importance in orthopedics, where variations in case complexity can dramatically influence performance assessment during conventional examinations [1,2,3].

Another defining strength of OSCE is its ability to evaluate multiple competencies within a limited time frame. A single orthopedic OSCE circuit can assess musculoskeletal examination techniques, trauma protocols, radiological interpretation, implant identification, fracture classification, procedural skills, and communication abilities [4]. This multidimensional evaluation closely mirrors real-world orthopedic practice, where surgeons must integrate clinical reasoning with technical skills and patient interaction simultaneously.

Clinical examination stations remain one of the most valuable components of orthopedic OSCEs. [1,5,6]. Candidates are expected to perform systematic joint examinations using standardized approaches such as inspection, palpation, range of motion assessment, special tests, and neurovascular evaluation. Stations involving shoulder instability, knee ligament injuries, spine assessment, or gait analysis encourage students to develop disciplined and reproducible examination habits. The timed nature of OSCE further trains candidates to prioritize clinically relevant findings efficiently, a skill that becomes invaluable in busy outpatient departments and emergency settings.

Trauma management stations add another important dimension to orthopedic assessment. Modern orthopedic training places enormous emphasis on emergency decision-making and adherence to trauma principles. OSCE stations simulating polytrauma scenarios, open fractures, compartment syndrome, or neurovascular compromise help assess the candidate's ability to respond systematically under pressure. Integration of Advanced Trauma Life Support (ATLS) principles into OSCEs has significantly strengthened the practical preparedness of trainees, especially in institutions managing high trauma volumes. [5,6].

Radiological interpretation stations have also become indispensable in orthopedic OSCEs. Orthopedic surgeons rely heavily on imaging for diagnosis and operative planning, making radiographic interpretation a core competency. Through structured X-ray, computed tomography, and magnetic resonance imaging interpretation stations, OSCE evaluates not only recognition of pathology but also fracture classification, implant planning, complication prediction, and management strategy formulation. Such stations test analytical thinking rather than mere memorization and encourage a systematic approach toward imaging assessment.

Procedural skill stations arguably represent one of the greatest advantages of OSCE over conventional practical examinations. Traditional viva-based assessments may test theoretical knowledge of casting or fracture reduction techniques without evaluating actual performance. OSCE bridges this gap through hands-on procedural stations involving plaster application, splinting, traction methods, suturing, reduction maneuvers, or external fixation assembly. Simulation models and mannequins allow candidates to demonstrate technical competence in a safe and controlled environment without compromising patient safety. [7,8,9].

An often underappreciated aspect of orthopedic training is communication. Historically, orthopedic education emphasized technical proficiency, sometimes at the expense of patient-centered interaction. Modern OSCEs have corrected this imbalance by incorporating communication stations

focused on informed consent, counseling, post-operative rehabilitation, complication discussion, and ethical dilemmas. Explaining operative risks to an elderly hip fracture patient or counseling parents regarding pediatric deformity correction requires empathy, clarity, and professionalism. Such competencies are difficult to assess in traditional examinations but are effectively evaluated through structured OSCE communication scenarios.

Beyond its role in assessment, OSCE has profoundly influenced the learning behavior of trainees. Students preparing for OSCE examinations often adopt a more systematic and clinically oriented approach to studying. Instead of focusing exclusively on theoretical memorization, trainees practice examination techniques, procedural steps, communication strategies, and clinical reasoning pathways. This shift toward active learning aligns closely with the principles of competency-based medical education and ultimately contributes to better clinical preparedness.

The educational value of OSCE also lies in its feedback potential. Structured examiner checklists allow detailed identification of strengths and weaknesses in candidate performance. Immediate or post-examination feedback enables trainees to recognize deficiencies in examination technique, communication, or procedural execution early in their training. Such formative assessment plays a crucial role in continuous professional development and encourages reflective learning habits among orthopedic residents.

Despite these advantages, OSCE is not without challenges. Conducting a high-quality orthopedic OSCE requires substantial logistical planning, financial investment, faculty training, and infrastructural support. Multiple stations, standardized patients, simulation equipment, examination materials, and trained evaluators are necessary for smooth implementation. In resource-constrained institutions, organizing large-scale OSCEs can be demanding. Furthermore, the preparation of reliable and validated checklists requires careful academic planning to ensure that assessment remains clinically meaningful rather than excessively mechanical.

Critics of OSCEs also argue that checklist-oriented evaluation may sometimes promote compartmentalized performance. Candidates may focus on completing individual checklist items rather than developing holistic clinical judgment. Real-life orthopedic practice involves uncertainty, nuanced decision-making, and longitudinal patient management, aspects that cannot always be replicated within brief timed stations. Therefore, while OSCE is highly effective for assessing defined competencies, it should ideally complement rather than completely replace traditional clinical assessment methods. [10].

Nevertheless, the future trajectory of orthopedic education strongly favors structured competency-based assessment systems. Advances in simulation technology, virtual reality training, artificial intelligence-assisted evaluation, and digital assessment platforms are likely to further refine the OSCE model. Virtual fracture simulations, arthroscopy simulators, and computer-assisted procedural assessment tools are already reshaping orthopedic surgical training across the world. These innovations have the potential to improve both the realism and reliability of future orthopedic OSCEs.

Importantly, OSCE should not be viewed merely as an examination pattern but as a broader educational philosophy centered on accountability, competence, and patient safety. It reflects a transition from subjective evaluation toward measurable clinical performance. For orthopedic educators, the challenge lies not only in designing standardized examinations but also in ensuring that these assessments preserve clinical depth, reasoning ability, professionalism, and humane patient care.

In modern orthopedic training, where society expects surgeons to be technically sound, ethically responsible, and clinically competent from the very beginning of independent practice, OSCE has established itself as an indispensable pillar of practical assessment. Its continued evolution will likely play a defining role in shaping the next generation of orthopedic surgeons and improving the overall standards of musculoskeletal healthcare delivery worldwide.

Declaration of patient consent: The authors certify that they have obtained all appropriate patient consent forms. In the form, the patient has given the consent for his/ her images and other clinical information to be reported in the journal. The patient understands that his/ her names and initials will not be published and due efforts will be made to conceal their identity, but anonymity cannot be guaranteed.

Conflict of interest: Nil **Source of support:** None

References

1. Harden RM, Gleeson FA. Assessment of clinical competence using an objective structured clinical examination (OSCE). Med Educ 1979;13:41-54.

2. Newble D. Techniques for measuring clinical competence: Objective structured clinical examinations. Med Educ 2004;38:199-203.

3. Khan K, Ramachandran S. Conceptualizing OSCEs in modern medical education. Clin Teach 2018;15:394-8.

4. Swanson DB, Van Der Vleuten C. Assessment of clinical skills with standardized patients. Med Educ 2013;47:3-4.

5. Berman JR, Durning SJ. The utility of OSCE in graduate medical education. J Grad Med Educ 2011;3:361-7.

6. Kumar P, Singh A. OSCE in orthopaedic postgraduate examination: Current perspectives. Indian J Orthop 2019;53:450-6.

7. Jayakumar P, Ramachandran M. Orthopaedic surgical training: The role of simulation. Bone Joint J 2018;100-B:1-6.

8. Ahmed K, Miskovic D, Darzi A, Athanasiou T, Hanna GB. Observational tools for assessment of procedural skills: A systematic review. Am J Surg 2011;202:469-80.e6.

9. Iqbal MH, Khan O, Aydın A. Simulation-based assessments in orthopaedic training. J Surg Educ 2020;77:1201-8.

10. Epstein RM. Assessment in medical education. N Engl J Med 2007;356:387-96.

Conflict of Interest: Nil
Source of Support: Nil

Consent: The authors confirm that informed consent was obtained from the patient for publication of this article

How to Cite this Article

Kale S, Roy M, Kumar V, Shyam A. Reimagining Orthopedic Practical Examinations: The Expanding Role of Objective Structured Clinical Examination. Journal of Orthopaedic Case Reports 2026 September;16(09): 10-13.