

**PP011**

**Dissections versus prosections, which method has a better impact on long term anatomy knowledge?**

**Balagobi B<sup>1</sup>, Wimalachandra M<sup>2</sup>, Hashintha M<sup>2</sup>, Ranasinghe N<sup>3</sup>, Niroshana L<sup>3</sup>, Anthony J<sup>2</sup>, Jayasekara R<sup>2</sup>,**

<sup>1</sup>*Colombo South Teaching Hospital*

<sup>2</sup>*University of Colombo*

<sup>3</sup>*National Hospital of Sri Lanka*

**Introduction and objectives**

The main goal of teaching anatomy to students in a medical curriculum is to lay a sound foundation on core concepts of anatomy. Dissections were the standard method of teaching gross anatomy. But there is a current trend towards the use of prosected specimens as a method of teaching and learning gross anatomy. Objective was to establish which method was more effective at establishing a core anatomy knowledge that

could be recalled after a considerable amount of time.

**Method**

Two groups of medical students in their final year were tested on the key concepts of gross anatomy using a question paper that included true false type questions and identification of anatomical line diagrams. These two batches of students followed a dissection based curriculum and a newly introduced prosections based curriculum at the beginning of their medical education respectively.

**Results**

Total duration spent on teaching for dissection group was 438 hours but for prosection group was 120 hours. Mean marks of dissection group was 54.08 (SD: 15.12) and prosection group was 57.74 (SD:12.74). There was no statistically significant difference in the marks obtained for the true false type questions between the two groups ( $p=0.076$ ), but the prosections group obtained higher marks for the diagram identification questions ( $p=0.022$ ).

**Conclusion**

A prosection based curriculum when compared to a dissection based curriculum was equally effective at establishing a core gross anatomy knowledge in considerably less amount of time.