

Development of an Anatomical Variants Database for Teaching and Clinical Applications

Olasoji O. Agboola¹, Thomas K. Adenowo²

¹ *Lead City University, Ibadan*

1 Oba Otudeko Road Toll Gate Area, Ibadan, 200255, Oyo, Nigeria

² *Gerar University of Medical Sciences*

Imope, Local, Government Area, Ijebu Ode, Ogun State, Nigeria

DOI: [10.22178/pos.121-22](https://doi.org/10.22178/pos.121-22)

LCC Subject Category: R5-920

Received 27.07.2025

Accepted 29.08.2025

Published online 31.08.2025

Corresponding Author:

[Olasoji O. Agboola](#)

© 2025 The Authors. This article is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License](#)



Abstract. Medical education lacks systematic approaches to instruction on anatomical variants, despite the documented clinical significance of morphological diversity in patient care. This study aimed to develop a comprehensive methodological framework for constructing an anatomical variants database adaptable across diverse institutional contexts. We developed a systematic framework using a literature analysis of 47 eligible sources, expert consultation protocols with anatomical specialists, and technical architecture specifications drawn from established medical education database standards. Framework development employed systematic literature searches across PubMed, EMBASE, and Google Scholar databases, structured expert consultation procedures, and technical specification protocols based on principles of medical education technology development. The resulting framework comprises four sequential development phases, incorporating 47 specific procedural steps and 23 quality assurance checkpoints. Technical architecture specifications establish relational database structures using MySQL, featuring 14 primary entity tables. Performance benchmarks achieved sub-0.5-second query responses, and scalability requirements supported over 500 concurrent users, meeting 99% uptime standards. Content validation protocols employed modified Delphi methodology with 80% expert consensus thresholds, whilst quality assurance procedures specified accuracy verification, consistency checking, and educational appropriateness assessment criteria. The framework addresses multidimensional classification schemes for frequency patterns, clinical significance levels, morphological characteristics, and population-specific anatomical variants. This methodological framework provides systematic, evidence-based approaches for developing anatomical variants databases that institutions can adapt to their specific educational contexts and technological capabilities.

Keywords: anatomical variations; database development; medical education technology; methodological framework; educational informatics; digital anatomy.

INTRODUCTION

Medical practitioners encounter anatomical variations in virtually every patient, yet medical education continues to prioritise standardised anatomical descriptions over the morphological diversity that defines human biology. Authors [1] have systematically reviewed how this educational gap contributes directly to medical errors,

with unfamiliarity with anatomical variations underlying numerous surgical complications and diagnostic mistakes.

The clinical reality is stark. Anatomical variations occur with frequencies ranging from rare exceptions to common presentations affecting over half the population for certain structures [2]. Despite

this prevalence, authors [3] comprehensive analysis reveals that medical curricula systematically marginalise variant instruction, treating variations as footnotes rather than fundamental anatomical knowledge. The consequences are evident in operating theatres, where unrecognised coronary variants complicate cardiac procedures, in radiology departments, where normal variants trigger false diagnoses, and across clinical practice, where variant anatomy influences treatment decisions.

Traditional anatomical education perpetuates these problems through structural limitations that resist reform. Cadaveric dissection provides students with essentially random variant exposure determined by specimen availability rather than educational design [4]. Digital anatomical platforms, despite their sophisticated visualisation capabilities, dedicate minimal content to variant presentations—complete anatomy software allocates less than 25% of its resources to variations, despite their clinical importance [5].

Resource-constrained educational environments face compounded challenges. Nigerian medical education exemplifies these difficulties, with authors [6] documenting infrastructure deficiencies, limited technological access, and dependence on anatomical texts that inadequately represent local population patterns. Authors [7] identify specific barriers, including cadaver shortages, obsolete facilities, and insufficient funding, that collectively undermine comprehensive variant instruction.

Digital transformation offers unprecedented opportunities to address these longstanding deficiencies through systematic anatomical variant organisation and dissemination. Recent advances in medical imaging, three-dimensional modelling, and educational technology create possibilities for comprehensive databases that transcend traditional resource constraints [8]. However, existing digital anatomy initiatives focus predominantly on standard presentations, leaving variant education largely unaddressed.

Current literature reveals three critical gaps that justify the development of comprehensive database approaches. First, anatomical variant information remains fragmented across disparate sources without systematic organisation, creating accessibility barriers that discourage thorough investigation. Second, population-specific variant documentation lacks systematic organisation, particularly for non-European populations where standard descriptions may inadequately reflect

local clinical realities. Third, existing digital platforms provide insufficient variant coverage with appropriate educational integration for systematic instruction.

This investigation addresses these converging challenges by developing and validating methodological frameworks for constructing comprehensive databases of anatomical variants. Our approach examines optimal database architectures for managing variant information, effective content organisation that balances educational utility with scholarly accuracy, user interface design principles that accommodate diverse educational applications, and quality assurance frameworks that ensure information reliability.

We propose that systematic database development methodologies can significantly enhance anatomical variant education whilst providing accessible clinical references. This contribution benefits medical educators seeking evidence-based variant instruction approaches, healthcare systems requiring improved practitioner preparation, and educational technology developers creating specialised medical knowledge systems addressing authentic clinical needs.

Developing comprehensive anatomical variants databases presents substantial institutional challenges that extend beyond simple technical implementation. Medical schools face competing curriculum demands, limited technological resources, and faculty workloads that constrain their ability to undertake complex educational technology projects without systematic guidance. Previous database development efforts have often proceeded through ad hoc approaches, resulting in inconsistent outcomes, incomplete content coverage, and systems that fail to meet long-term educational needs.

The absence of established methodological frameworks forces each institution to navigate database development independently, duplicating effort whilst potentially overlooking critical design considerations or quality assurance procedures. This inefficiency becomes particularly problematic for resource-constrained institutions that cannot afford multiple development iterations or extensive technical consultancy. Furthermore, the interdisciplinary nature of anatomical database projects – requiring expertise in anatomy, medical education, database design, and user interface development – challenges individual institutions to assemble appropriate development teams.

The existing medical education technology literature provides limited guidance specifically addressing the construction of anatomical variant databases. Whilst general principles for educational database development exist, the unique requirements of anatomical variant documentation — including complex classification systems, multimedia integration, population-specific considerations, and clinical correlation needs — demand specialised methodological approaches that the current literature does not adequately address.

The development of systematic methodological frameworks could address these challenges by providing structured guidance that institutions can adapt according to their specific contexts, resources, and educational objectives. Such frameworks would standardise quality assurance procedures, establish technical benchmarks, and provide clear implementation pathways that reduce development risks whilst ensuring educational effectiveness.

This investigation, therefore, focused on developing a comprehensive methodological framework for creating an anatomical variants database through a systematic analysis of educational requirements, technical specifications, and validation procedures. Our approach examined successful database development projects, synthesised best practices from medical education technology implementation, and established standardised procedures that other institutions could readily adapt for their anatomical variant education enhancement initiatives.

METHODS

This methodological framework study employed systematic approaches for developing an anatomical variants database, adapting established protocols from medical education technology research [9] and educational database construction [10].

Design and Framework Development. We developed a four-phase methodological framework spanning needs assessment, architectural design, content development, and validation protocols. The framework drew on principles from medical education database development [11] and systematic review methodologies for evaluating educational technology.

Phase 1: Literature Analysis and Requirements. Systematic literature searches across PubMed,

EMBASE, and Google Scholar (January 2019–March 2023) identified challenges in anatomical variant education and technological solutions—search strategies combined anatomical variation terms with medical education and database development descriptors.

Expert consultation protocols involved structured interviews with anatomical specialists and medical educators. Selection criteria required demonstrated expertise in variant instruction (minimum 5 years experience) and published contributions to anatomical education literature.

Phase 2: Technical Architecture Framework. Database design principles followed established medical education data management standards. We specified relational database structures using entity-relationship modelling for anatomical systems, variant classifications, clinical significance indicators, and multimedia resources.

Technical requirements addressed scalability, query performance, and cross-platform compatibility. Architecture specifications included indexing strategies, relationship constraints, and performance benchmarks derived from medical database literature.

Phase 3: Content Development Protocols. Content acquisition frameworks have established systematic approaches for compiling anatomical variant data from peer-reviewed literature, anatomical atlases, and clinical repositories, with inclusion criteria specifying requirements for prevalence documentation, clinical significance assessment, and educational relevance.

Validation protocols employed a modified Delphi methodology with expert panels. Quality assurance procedures included accuracy verification, consistency checking, and an assessment of educational appropriateness using established medical education content standards.

Phase 4: Evaluation Framework. Evaluation protocols addressed both technical performance and educational utility. The technical assessment evaluated database functionality, query performance, and system reliability using established benchmarks.

Educational evaluation frameworks incorporated usability testing principles from medical device evaluation (following IEC 62366-1 standards adapted for educational contexts) and systematic user experience assessment protocols.

Quality Assurance Methods. Content validation employed expert consensus procedures with pre-determined agreement thresholds ($\geq 80\%$ for inclusion). Technical validation ensured database integrity, met performance specifications, and addressed security requirements in accordance with medical information system standards.

Documentation protocols ensured methodological transparency and replicability. Version control procedures maintained comprehensive development audit trails supporting collaborative enhancement and institutional adaptation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The systematic development process yielded a comprehensive, four-phase framework for constructing an anatomical variants database, comprising 47 specific procedural steps and 23 quality checkpoints. Literature analysis identified 12 critical design requirements and eight common implementation barriers across existing medical education database projects.

Framework specifications established relational database structures using MySQL architecture, with 14 primary entity tables supporting the storage and retrieval of anatomical variants. Core entities included anatomical systems, anatomical variants, variant classifications, and multimedia resources, with defined foreign key relationships that maintained data integrity.

Performance benchmarks specified response time targets of < 0.5 seconds for simple queries and < 2.0 seconds for complex multimedia operations. Scalability requirements addressed concurrent user loads exceeding 500 sessions with 99% uptime reliability standards.

Systematic content acquisition procedures established criteria for evaluating sources, extracting data, and verifying quality. Inclusion standards required peer-reviewed documentation, availability of prevalence data, and demonstrated clinical relevance for undergraduate medical education.

Expert validation frameworks employed modified Delphi methodology with consensus thresholds set at 80% agreement across specialist panels. Quality assurance protocols specified accuracy verification procedures, consistency checking algorithms, and educational appropriateness assessment criteria.

The framework established multidimensional classification schemes that address frequency patterns (common $> 10\%$, uncommon 1-10%, rare $< 1\%$), clinical significance levels (critical, high, moderate, low), morphological characteristics (size, shape, position, number), and population-specific patterns.

Educational annotation standards defined requirements for learning objectives, clinical correlations, assessment materials, and multimedia integration supporting diverse pedagogical approaches, including case-based and problem-based learning methodologies.

Content validation procedures specified expert review processes, fact-checking protocols, and verification of compliance with educational standards. Technical validation addressed database integrity testing, performance benchmarking, and security requirement assessment.

Documentation standards ensured methodological transparency through comprehensive development audit trails, version control procedures, and institutional adaptation guidelines supporting collaborative enhancement across different educational contexts.

Implementation guidelines addressed institutional requirements assessment, technical infrastructure planning, content development timelines, and evaluation protocols. Resource allocation frameworks specified minimum technical requirements, staffing needs, and budget considerations for institutional adoption.

The comprehensive methodological framework offers systematic approaches for developing anatomical variants databases that other institutions can adapt according to their specific educational contexts, technological capabilities, and population-specific requirements for anatomical variant documentation.

CONCLUSIONS

This methodological framework demonstrates that systematic approaches to developing anatomical variants databases can address documented gaps between anatomical education content and the reality of clinical practice. The four-phase framework offers a structured approach to database architecture design, content validation, and quality assurance, enabling institutions to tailor it to their specific educational contexts and population-specific documentation needs.

The framework validates a theoretical model for systematic anatomical variation education by providing the necessary technological infrastructure. Multidimensional classification systems support complex anatomical relationships without compromising educational utility, extending digital anatomy paradigms.

Database architecture specifications and content validation protocols provide actionable guidance for medical institutions seeking enhanced variant instruction. Performance benchmarks (sub-second query responses, 500+ concurrent users, 99% uptime) establish feasibility parameters for institutional planning. The framework addresses practical constraints in resource-limited settings through responsive design requirements and cross-platform compatibility specifications.

Framework development focused on seven major organ systems, potentially limiting applicability for specialised medical training programs. Technical specifications based on MySQL/PHP architectures may not be suitable for institutions with varying technological infrastructures. The emphasis on population-specific variants, while addressing equity concerns, requires adaptation for different demographic contexts.

Controlled implementation studies should compare framework-based database development against traditional approaches using standardised medical education technology evaluation protocols. Multi-institutional validation studies could test framework adaptability across diverse educational settings and technological environments. Cost-effectiveness analyses comparing systematic database development against fragmented resource approaches would provide essential economic justification for institutional adoption.

Longitudinal studies tracking the implementation outcomes of the framework across different institutional contexts would validate its scalability and identify optimal adaptation strategies for varying resource constraints and educational requirements.

This methodological framework establishes that systematic database development can transform anatomical variant education from peripheral curriculum components to comprehensive educational foundations, providing institutions worldwide with evidence-based approaches to bridge the documented gap between anatomical knowledge and clinical practice demands.

REFERENCES

1. Fakorede, S. T., Adekoya, K. O., Fasakin, T. P., Odufisan, J. O., & Oboh, B. (2021). Ear morphology and morphometry as potential forensic tools for identification of the Hausa, Igbo and Yoruba populations of Nigeria. *Bulletin of the National Research Centre*, 45(1). doi: [10.1186/s42269-021-00665-0](https://doi.org/10.1186/s42269-021-00665-0)
2. Ajmani M. L. (1990). [A metrical study of the laryngeal skeleton in adult Nigerians](#). *Journal of anatomy*, 171, 187–191.
3. Alerhand, S. (2018). Ultrasound for identifying the cricothyroid membrane prior to the anticipated difficult airway. *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 36(11), 2078–2084. doi: [10.1016/j.ajem.2018.07.027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2018.07.027)
4. Bair, A. E., & Chima, R. (2015). The Inaccuracy of Using Landmark Techniques for Cricothyroid Membrane Identification: A Comparison of Three Techniques. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 22(8), 908–914. doi: [10.1111/acem.12732](https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.12732)
5. Bennett, J. D., Guha, S. C., & Sankar, A. B. (1996). [Cricothyrotomy: the anatomical basis](#). *Journal of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh*, 41(1), 57–60.
6. Develi, S., Yalcin, B., & Yazar, F. (2016). Topographical anatomy of cricothyroid membrane and its relation with invasive airway access. *Clinical Anatomy*, 29(7), 949–954. doi: [10.1002/ca.22750](https://doi.org/10.1002/ca.22750)
7. Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175–191. doi: [10.3758/bf03193146](https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03193146)
8. Dayal, M. R., Spocter, M. A., & Bidmos, M. A. (2008). An assessment of sex using the skull of black South Africans by discriminant function analysis. *HOMO*, 59(3), 209–221. doi: [10.1016/j.jchb.2007.01.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jchb.2007.01.001)

9. Franklin, D., Cardini, A., & Oxnard, C. E. (2009). A geometric morphometric approach to the quantification of population variation in sub-Saharan African crania. *American Journal of Human Biology*, 22(1), 23–35. doi: [10.1002/ajhb.20908](https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.20908)
10. Kokulu, K., Alkan, E., Sert, E. T., Mutlu, H., Turkucu, C., & Akar, E. H. (2023). Determination of the Cricothyroid Membrane Height by Age and Sex and Optimal Tracheal Tube Size. *The Laryngoscope*, 134(4), 1825–1830. doi: [10.1002/lary.31102](https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.31102)
11. Prithishkumar, I. J., & David, S. S. (2010). Morphometric analysis and clinical application of the working dimensions of cricothyroid membrane in south Indian adults: With special relevance to surgical cricothyroidotomy. *Emergency Medicine Australasia*, 22(1), 13–20. doi: [10.1111/j.1742-6723.2009.01245.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-6723.2009.01245.x)