Appendix 1: Pro-formas Used to Review Case Notes from the UK Study and the US Study.

[UK Study]

<u>Semi-structured Implicit Pro forma for Collection of Data on</u> <u>Preventability of Mortality in Acute Medical Care in West Midlands Hospitals</u>

Section 1 - Background

	Case Note Ref Number:					
	Date of Review:					
	Date of Admission:					
' .	Date of Death :					
	Initials of Reviewer:					
i.	Patient's Age :					
ii. Patient's Sex :						
_	Section 2 – Review of the notes					
a.	Primary working diagnoses following admission in the case-notes:					
	(Take diagnosis from the ward round in the first 48 hours post-admission when a ward round seems to					
	have established a coherent management plan. If these do not exist take information from admission notes and tick here:)					
b.	Primary diagnosis on admission according to the reviewer's opinion:					
	Agree with the above;					
	Partially agree with the above;					
	_ , , ,					
	☐ Do not agree with the above;					

Final I	Primary o	diagnosis after establishment of all results according to the reviewer's opinion:
		Agree with the above;
		Partially agree with the above;
		Do not agree with the above;
	Pleas	e explain:
Know	n active	co-morbidities on admission according to the case-notes:
Know	n active	co-morbidities on admission according to the reviewer's opinion:
		Agree with the above;
		Partially agree with the above;
		Do not agree with the above;
	Pleas	e explain:
New d	iagnoses	that post-dated admission, according to the case-notes:
New d	iagnoses	that post-dated admission, according to the reviewer's opinion :
		Agree with the above;
		Partially agree with the above;
		Partially agree with the above; Do not agree with the above;

4a.	Primary	cause of	f death according to the last entry in the notes of doctor for cause of death:				
			a) GP letter - explain				
	b) Post Mortem - explain		b) Post Mortem - explain				
C) Last entry in case-notes - explain		c) Last entry in case-notes - explain					
			d) Not given				
4b.	Primary	cause of	f death according to reviewer's opinion:				
			Agree with the above; if not given in the notes, please give your view:				
			Partially agree with the above;				
		☐ Please	Do not agree with the above; explain:				
5.	Please s	core the	e following:				
5a.	Were the	re clear	management plans throughout the admission?:				
			1. Definitely yes				
			2. Probably yes				
			3. Uncertain				
			4. Probably not				
			5. Definitely not				
		Please	explain:				

	admission:	
		1. Definitely appropriate
		2. Probably appropriate
		3. Uncertain
		4. Probably not appropriate
		5. Definitely not appropriate
	Pleas	se explain:
5c.	Timeliness of	diagnostic procedures and evaluation for patient's problem(s) throughout the admission:
		1. Definitely timely
		2. Probably timely
		3. Uncertain
		4. Probably not timely
		5. Definitely not timely
	Pleas	se explain:
5d.		ess of doctor's orders (management and treatment) for patient's problem(s) throughout including inappropriate care / omissions / poor response to new diagnostic results:
		1. Definitely appropriate
		2. Probably appropriate
		3. Uncertain
		4. Probably not appropriate
		5. Definitely not appropriate

Appropriateness of diagnostic work-up (investigations) for patient's problem(s) throughout the

5b.

		Please	e explain:
5e. throu			octors giving their management and treatment orders for patient's problem(s) ion, including delayed orders, delayed response to diagnostic results and delayed
speci	ality referr	al visits	
			1. Definitely timely
			2. Probably timely
			3. Uncertain
			4. Probably not timely
			5. Definitely not timely
		Please	e explain:
5f. or flui			ing doctor's orders (timeliness and appropriateness), including administering medicines notification throughout the admission:
			Definitely no errors
			2. Probably no errors
			3. Uncertain
			4. Probably yes, had errors
			5. Definitely yes, had errors
		Please	e explain:

6.	Please note any adverse events that were <u>not</u> the result of poor care (expected adverse events, for example due to expected side effects of drugs or procedures):							
6a.								
6b.								
6c								
6d.								
7.	Please note any adverse events that <u>might have been</u> the result of poor care , including apparent omissions and episodes of sub-standard care in the following areas.							
	8a. Diagnostic results either not acted upon, or acted upon after a delay;							
	8b. Delay in care / inappropriate care / omission of care / poor response to direction of care;							
	8c. Lack of plan for care / unclear direction of care;							
	8d. Medication error (omissions and commissions, including fluid errors).							
	Adverse Event Error that caused it							
								
								

8.	Rate the	quality	of notes	and their	comple	teness <u>ir</u>	terms o	f your ab	ility to ex	tract the	
infor	mation req	uired to	fill this for	<u>m</u> (<i>plea</i> s	e chose	one):					
			1. Defini	tely adec	luate						
			2. Proba	ıbly adeq	uate						
			3. Uncer	tain							
			4. Proba	bly not a	dequate						
			5. Defini	tely not a	dequate						
		Please	e explain:								
9.	Please g	ive a ve	ry brief sy	nopsis of	this adm	nission ar	nd events	s before o	death:		
10.	Overall h	ow wou	ıld you ran	k this pa	tients ca	are durino	n this adı	mission c	n a ten n	oint scal	e
			ar vertical	_			_				
	(6.00.00)		a. 707.000.								
	ı										ĺ
						1					
	Ó	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
	(Very bad)				(Adequate)					(Very good)

		of probability (>50% chance), was the patient's death preventable through care during this admission?
		1. Definitely yes
		2. Probably yes
		3. Uncertain
		4. Probably not
		5. Definitely not
	Ш	5. Definitely not
	Divi	
	on the fol	llowing scale your best estimate of the likelihood of preventability of death
care i	on the fol	llowing scale your best estimate of the likelihood of preventability of death nission had been optimal (<i>please put a clear vertical line on the scale where y</i>
care i	on the fol in this adm d to mark): 1	llowing scale your best estimate of the likelihood of preventability of death nission had been optimal (<i>please put a clear vertical line on the scale where y</i>
care i	on the fol in this adm d to mark): 1	llowing scale your best estimate of the likelihood of preventability of death nission had been optimal (<i>please put a clear vertical line on the scale where y</i> ::
care i	on the folin this admid to mark): 10% If this patie	llowing scale your best estimate of the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where your is seen to see the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where your is seen to see the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where your is seen to see the scale where your is seen to see the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where your is seen to see the scale where your is seen to see the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where your is seen to see the scale where your is seen to see the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where your is seen to see the scale where your is seen to see the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where your is seen to see the scale where your is seen to see the likelihood of the scale where your is seen to see the
care i intend	on the folin this admid to mark): 10% If this patie	llowing scale your best estimate of the likelihood of preventability of death nission had been optimal (<i>please put a clear vertical line on the scale where y</i> ::
care i intend	on the folin this admid to mark): 10% If this patie	llowing scale your best estimate of the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where your is seen to see the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where your is seen to see the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where your is seen to see the scale where your is seen to see the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where your is seen to see the scale where your is seen to see the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where your is seen to see the scale where your is seen to see the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where your is seen to see the scale where your is seen to see the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where your is seen to see the scale where your is seen to see the likelihood of the scale where your is seen to see the
care i intend	on the folin this admid to mark): 10% If this patie	llowing scale your best estimate of the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where yet): 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% If you choose 25% or less, then please go to question 16. The period of their original functionality before this episode of illnessen, if optimum care was offered (no errors in care were made) and patient had
care i	on the folin this admid to mark): 10% If this patie	llowing scale your best estimate of the likelihood of preventability of death hission had been optimal (please put a clear vertical line on the scale where yet is in the scal

				I if optimum care		
\square < 7 days \square 7 – 30 days \square 1 – 6 months \square 6 – 12 months \square > 12 months						
	<u>Secti</u>	on 3 – Quality Contro	<u>ol</u>			
low long did it ta	ke you to review this	s record and complete	e the questions?			
minutes						
		Further Notes				
	was given (no e	was given (no errors in care were m <pre></pre>	was given (no errors in care were made) and patient had <pre> < 7 days</pre>	Section 3 – Quality Control How long did it take you to review this record and complete the questions? minutes		

Laboratory Indicator Study Abstraction Form for Review of Deaths

a) Patient key: «KEY»

b) Chart ID:

c) Admission Date: «ADMDATE»
d) Discharge Date: «DISDATE»
e) Age: «AGE» years

f) Sex: «SEX»

g) Discharge Status: «DISPTYPE» (1-5 Alive, 6-7 Dead)

2. Residence before Admission

- a) 1. Home
 - 2. Board & Care
 - 3. Nursing Home
 - 4. Relatives/Friends
 - 5. Uncertain
 - 6. Other b)

3. DNR

- a) 1. No
 - 2. Yes, specify on which hospital day: b) _____
- c) Did an hospital complication or major decline occur prior to DNR status? 1. No 2. Yes

4. Inpatient Errors in Management

- a) Timeliness of diagnostic evaluation for presenting problem(s)?
 - 1. Definitely timely
 - 2. Probably timely
 - 3. Uncertain
 - 4. Probably not timely
 - 5. Definitely not timely
- b) Appropriateness of diagnostic work-up for presenting problem(s)?
 - 1. Definitely appropriate
 - 2. Probably appropriate
 - 3. Uncertain
 - 4. Probably not appropriate
 - 5. Definitely not appropriate

c)	Timeliness of Initiation of treatment and obtaining consultation for presenting problem(s)?
	1. Definitely timely
	2. Probably timely
	3. Uncertain
	4. Probably not timely
	5. Definitely not timely
d)	Appropriateness of doctor's orders for patient's presenting problems?
	Definitely appropriate
	2. Probably appropriate
	3. Uncertain
	4. Probably not appropriate
	5. Definitely not appropriate
e) E	Errors In following doctors' orders, administering medicines, or physician notification?
	1. Definitely yes
	2. Probably yes
	3. Uncertain
	4. Probably not
	5. Definitely not
f)	Appropriateness of physicians' response to new In-hospital signs, symptoms, or test results?
	1. Definitely appropriate
	2. Probably appropriate
	3. Uncertain
	4. Probably not appropriate
	5. Definitely not appropriate
g)	Procedural/Technical Adverse Outcomes?
	Major adverse outcome What procedure?
	2. Moderate adverse outcome
	3. Minor adverse outcome What adverse outcome?
	4. No adverse outcome
<u>5. F</u>	Preventable ?
a) V	Vas patient death preventable by better quality of care?
	1. Definitely yes
	2. Probably yes
	3. Uncertain
	4. Probably not
	5. Definitely not
b)	Please comment:
	

c) V	What do you estimate the likeliho	od of prevention of death to be if care had been optimal?%
If pa	atient had recovered from his/her	acute/presenting illness (as well as could be expected), and had received optimal care,
-	t would you rate as the probabili	
d)	Have left the hospital alive	
e)	Lived three months or more	
f)	3. Lived six months or more	
g)	4. Lived one year or more	
h)	5. Lived five years or more	
If pa	atient had recovered from his/her	acute/presenting illness/complication (as well as could be expected), and had received
-		d be the probability of the patient returning to:
i)	Good physical functioning	
j)	2. Good cognitive functioning	
• •		
6. A	dequacy of Documentation in	Medical Record
a)	Definitely adequate	
,	Probably adequate	
	3. Uncertain	
	Probably not adequate	
	5. Definitely not adequate	
7. C	verall Quality of Medical Care	
a)	1. Superior	
ω,	2. Excellent	
	3. Good	
	4. Borderline	
	Substandard	
	6. Poor	
	0. 1 001	
b)	If you answered 4-6, please	specify reasons:
۵,	ii you anonorou i o, pioaco	opeony readene.
<u>8.</u>		
a)	b)	c)/
	Reviewer Initials	Estimated time (in minutes) for this review Date