

Washington University School of Medicine Digital Commons@Becker

Conference Abstracts and Posters

Division of Emergency Medicine/Emergency Care
Research Section

2013

Does a physician advanced directive survey predict bedside response in simulated end of life scenarios?

Christopher R. Carpenter

Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis

Timothy Cooney

Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis

Jason Wagner

Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis

Christopher Sampson

Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis

Nicholas Renz

Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wustl.edu/em_conf

Recommended Citation

Carpenter, Christopher R.; Cooney, Timothy; Wagner, Jason; Sampson, Christopher; Renz, Nicholas; Stickles, Sean; and Mirarchi, Ferdinando, "Does a physician advanced directive survey predict bedside response in simulated end of life scenarios?" (2013).

Conference Abstracts and Posters. Paper 2.

http://digitalcommons.wustl.edu/em_conf/2

This Presentation Poster is brought to you for free and open access by the Division of Emergency Medicine/Emergency Care Research Section at Digital Commons@Becker. It has been accepted for inclusion in Conference Abstracts and Posters by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Becker. For more information, please contact engeszer@wustl.edu.

Authors

Christopher R. Carpenter, Timothy Cooney, Jason Wagner, Christopher Sampson, Nicholas Renz, Sean Stickle, and Ferdinando Mirarchi

Christopher Carpenter MD MSc,¹ Timothy Cooney,² Jason Wagner MD,¹ Christopher Sampson MD,¹ Nicholas Renz MD,¹ Sean Stickles MD,¹ Ferdinando Mirarchi DO²

BACKGROUND

Divisions of Emergency Medicine ¹Washington University in St. Louis School of Medicine, ²UPMC Hamot Medical Center

- Advanced directives (AD) are intended to direct patient's future medical care during periods of decision-making incapacity
- Professional societies advocate AD to support patient autonomy and promote nonmaleficence
- Emergency medicine (EM) graduate medical education leaders identify obtainment and interpretation of AD as a minimal core competency for residents

OBJECTIVES

- To assess EM resident accuracy in interpreting AD in the emergency department (ED) during simulated acute life-threatening medical events
- Secondary objective to evaluate differences in interpretation or clinical actions between an online AD survey and the identical simulation scenario

METHODS

- Single academic medical center observational study of consenting EM residents, adhering to Strengthening of Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) criteria
- All participants completed online AD survey 2-months prior to a regularly scheduled simulation session
- Survey included participant demographics as well as six typical emergency scenarios with each case descriptor preceded by an AD (Boxes 1 and 2)
- Respondents assigned a code status and next most appropriate intervention for each patient
- The simulation lab occurred over 4-hours on one day and used the same 6 scenarios evaluated in the pre-simulation survey
- Participants were not reminded of the pre-survey and were asked to assign a code status using an electronic audience response system within 20-seconds after receiving the pre-hospital report
- Pre- and post-survey responses analyzed using contingency table analysis (Chi-square, Fisher's Exact Test)

Table: Descriptive Statistics for 17 Participants Completing Pre- and Simulation-Survey (N = 17)

| Descriptor | Value (mean or proportion) |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Age | 30 ± 3 |
| Male Gender | 71% |
| Prior AD Training | 0% |
| Medical School Region | |
| Midwest | 65% |
| South | 29% |
| Northeast | 0% |
| West | 0% |
| Resident Level | |
| PGY I | 29% |
| PGY II | 35% |
| PGY III | 12% |
| PGY IV | 24% |

Box 1: Sample Advanced Directive

(My specific instructions to my family and health care providers)

I, _____, being of sound mind, willfully and voluntarily make this declaration to be followed if I become incompetent. This declaration reflects my firm and settled commitment to refuse life-sustaining treatment under the circumstances indicated below. I direct my attending physician to withhold or withdraw life-sustaining treatment that serves only to prolong the process of dying, if I should be in a terminal condition or in a state of persistent unconsciousness. I direct the treatment be limited to measures to keep me comfortable and to relieve pain, including any pain that might occur by withholding or withdrawing life-sustaining treatment. In addition, if I am in the condition described above, I feel especially strong about the following forms of treatment:

- I () do (x) do not want cardiopulmonary resuscitation.
- I () do (x) do not want electroconversion.
- I () do (x) do not want mechanical respiration.
- I () do (x) do not want tube feeding or any other artificial or invasive form of nutrition (food) or hydration (water)
- I () do (x) do not want blood or blood products.
- I () do (x) do not want any form of surgery or invasive diagnostic tests.
- I () do (x) do not want kidney dialysis.

After reading this Living Will, how do you interpret the following questions for an individual patient in the ED?

RESULTS

- A total of 47 residents completed either the pre-survey or the simulation lab, but only 17 completed both
- The 17 completing both surveys did not differ significantly from the 30 who did not by any demographic parameter measured (Table)
- Of the 26 pre-simulation respondents:
 - 69% assigned a DNR code to AD scenarios and 64% did not enact life-saving measures
 - senior residents (PGY 3 or 4) assigned DNR more frequently (81% vs. 60%) and were less apt to elect life-saving interventions (21% vs. 49%, p>0.05)
- Among the 29 simulation residents:
 - 50% interpreted the AD as DNR and 40% did not attempt any resuscitation
 - resident training level (PGY 3 or 4 vs. PGY 1 or 2) did not impact code status assigned (51% vs. 53%), but senior level residents more often opted for resuscitation (72% vs. 57%, p > 0.05)
- In the simulation lab resident training level did not impact code status assigned, but senior-level residents more often opted for resuscitation

CONCLUSION

- In assessing EM resident AD clinical response, physicians are more likely to provide life-sustaining actions in simulation than in internet surveys
- Senior-level residents tend to disregard AD more commonly in simulation than in surveys

Box 2: Sample Scenario

46-year-old female presents with complaints of chest pain, shortness of breath and diaphoresis. Vitals: T: 37C, P: 110, BP: 130/70, RR: 30, SaO2: 97%. The patient has been given oxygen, aspirin, and nitroglycerin en route. Pre-hospital ECG shows acute anterior wall STEMI. EMS presents you with a list of medications and their living will. Abruptly her status changes as you evaluate her. She becomes unresponsive and develops VT/VF arrest.

Question 1: What is her code status based on her living will?

- a) DNR
- b) Full Code

Question 2: What is the next course of action?

- a) Defibrillate
- b) Don't defibrillate

