

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

**BMJ** Open

# **BMJ Open**

#### Protocol for a randomized trial evaluating the effect of applying gamification to simulation-based endoscopy training

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-024134
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	13-May-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Scaffidi, Michael; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Khan, Rishad; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Walsh, Catharine; Hospital for Sick Children, Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition, Learning Institute, and Research Institute; University of Toronto, The Wilson Centre Pearl, Matthew; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Winger, Kathleen; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Kalaichandran, Ruben; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Lin, Peter; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Grover, Samir; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology
Keywords:	Endoscopy < GASTROENTEROLOGY, MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING, Simulation

SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts

60

1	
2	
3	Protocol for a randomized trial evaluating the effect of applying gamification to simulation-
4	based endoscopy training
5	Michael A. Cooffidi <sup>1</sup> : Dished Khan <sup>1</sup> : Osthering M. Welch <sup>3,4</sup> : Matthew Deerl <sup>1</sup> : Kathleen Winger <sup>1</sup> :
6	Ruben Kalaichandran <sup>1</sup> : Peter Lin <sup>1</sup> Samir C. Grover <sup>1</sup>
7	
8	
9	Division of Gastroenterology, St. Michael's Hospital <sup>1</sup>
10	Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition, Learning Institute, and
11	Research Institute, Hospital for Sick Children <sup>3</sup>
12	The Wilson Centre, University of Toronto <sup>4</sup>
13	
14	Author Contributions
15	All authors contributed substantially to conception and the design of the protocol, all revised
16	the manuscript critically for important intellectual content, all approved the final manuscript. All
17	authors will have access to the final data set. MAS and SCG are accountable for all aspects
18	of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the
19	work are appropriately investigated and resolved.
20	Trial Deviator tions - Olivia Habitation - NOT00470054
21	That Registration: Clinicaltrial.gov NC103176251.
22	Funding Agencies: This work was supported by the Canadian Association of
23	Gastroenterology and the AbbVie Centre of Excellence in Continuing Health Education Igrant
24	number: 2017CAG-ABBVIE-ERG].
25	
26	Declarations: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.
27	
28	
29	
30 21	Corresponding Author:
21 22	Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC
5Z 22	Division of Gastroenterology
24	St. Michael's Hospital
25	16-036 Cardinal Carter Wing
36	30 Bond Street
37	TOTORIO, URIARIO MOB TW8 Phone: (416) 864 5628 Eav: (416) 864 5882
38	F-mail: grovers@smb.ca
30	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	

#### Abstract

**Background:** Simulation-based training provides a safe environment and effective means to enhance skills development. Simulation-based curricula have been developed for a number of procedures, including gastrointestinal endoscopy. Gamification, which is the application of game-design principles to non-game contexts, is an instructional strategy with potential to enhance learning. The application of gamification has not previously been evaluated in the context of a procedural skills simulation-based training curriculum.

**Methods and analysis:** Thirty-six novice endoscopists will be randomized to one of two endoscopy simulation-based training curricula: (1) the Conventional Curriculum Group, in which participants will receive 6 hours of one-on-one simulation training augmented with expert feedback and interlaced with 4 hours of small group teaching on the theory of colonoscopy; or (2) the Gamified Curriculum Group, in which participants will receive the same curriculum with integration of the following game-design elements: a leaderboard summarizing participant performance, game narrative, achievement badges, and rewards for top performance. In line with a progressive learning approach, simulation training for participants will progress from low to high complexity simulators, starting with a bench top model and then moving to the EndoVR® virtual reality simulator. Performance will be assessed at three points: pre-training, immediately post-training and 4-6 weeks after training. Assessments will take place on the simulator at all three time points and transfer of skills will be assessed during two clinical colonoscopies 4-6 weeks post-training. Mixed factorial ANOVAs will be used to determine if there is a performance difference between the two groups during simulated and clinical assessments.

**Ethics and dissemination:** Ethical approval was obtained at St. Michael's Hospital. Results of this trial will be submitted for presentation at academic meetings and for publication in a peer-reviewed journal.

#### Article summary: Strengths and limitations of this study

- The intervention in this randomized trial is a comprehensive gamified simulationbased curriculum in gastrointestinal endoscopy that includes a game narrative, performance tracking measures, and rewards. These game-design elements are grounded in educational theory.
- The primary outcome is clinical performance of live colonoscopies on real patients, which will be assessed by two blinded independent expert endoscopists using an assessment tool with strong validity evidence.
- Participants will be assessed immediately after training for skill acquisition, and 4-6 weeks after training to evaluate skill retention and transfer of skills to the clinical environment.
- There are significant human resources required for implementation with respect to tracking participants' game metrics and adjusting leaderboards.

Key Words: simulation; colonoscopy; gamification; skill acquisition

#### Introduction

Simulation-based training (SBT) provides a safe and effective means to enhance skills development in gastrointestinal endoscopy.<sup>1,2</sup> SBT is more effective when embedded within a curriculum that is grounded in educational theory.<sup>3–6</sup> While previous studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of comprehensive structured curricula and curricula based on a progressive learning approach<sup>4,7</sup>, other instructional strategies may further enhance procedural skills training.

One such enhancement may lie in gamification. Gamification refers to the application of game design elements, (conceptual building blocks central to creating successful games) to traditionally non-game contexts.<sup>8–10</sup> The overall purpose of gamification is to "encourage behavioral change and promote desired attitudes."<sup>11</sup> Gamification has previously been applied in health-related settings such as health promotion and e-health.<sup>12–14</sup> More recently, it has been gaining traction in the medical education setting, as gamification has the potential to improve learning and learner attention, engagement, motivation and behaviour change.<sup>8,15</sup> In a recent randomized trial, participants were ranked on a leaderboard as they completed cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) training.<sup>16</sup> After training, participants who were ranked on a leaderboard had significantly better technical skills acquisition on the CPR training device. Another recent trial evaluated the effect of competition on novices' ability to learn simulated laparoscopic cholecystectomy.<sup>17</sup> The authors found that participants who engaged in competition demonstrated fewer movements and a shorter path length, suggesting increased efficiency.

While these reports highlight the potential benefits of gamification in educational contexts, the use of leaderboards and competition represent narrow applications of gamification. To date, there are no studies that have investigated the application of a comprehensive gamified curriculum that integrates multiple game design elements for procedural learning in medicine. Additionally, no studies have reported clinical outcomes on real patients. To bridge these gaps, we aim to determine the impact of a gamified simulation-based curriculum in endoscopy on clinical performance, compared to an identical curriculum that does not incorporate game design elements.

#### Methods & Analysis

#### **Study Design**

This single-blinded, parallel group, randomized controlled trial (RCT) is currently being conducted at St. Michael's Hospital in Toronto, Canada. The methodology was adapted from previous studies by our group.<sup>3,4,18</sup> We used the SPIRIT checklist when writing our report.<sup>19</sup> The study design is summarized below in **Figure 1**.

#### Participants

Thirty-six novice endoscopists (performed < 25 previous real and/or simulated colonoscopies) will be recruited by one author (MAS). Participants will be included if they are from the general surgery or gastroenterology residency programs at the University of Toronto. Participants will be excluded if they have performed greater than 25 previous real and/or simulated colonoscopies.

#### Simulators

#### Bench Top Simulator

The bench top colonoscopy simulator is comprised of a series of vertical wooden barriers with numbered holes conforming to 27 different sequences of varying complexity. Participants use a real videocolonoscope, which provides visual output, to navigate through each sequence. This bench top endoscopy simulator helps develop general endoscopic skills and has shown good validity evidence for training novices.<sup>20</sup>

#### Virtual Reality Simulator

The EndoVR® virtual reality (VR) endoscopy simulator (CAE Healthcare, Montreal) is used for the VR training and all simulator tests. It models navigation through a colon, using a specialized endoscope that is inserted into a computer-based module with a screen showing

the colonic lumen of a virtual patient. It provides visual and haptic feedback related to the procedure. The simulator has several standardized case-based scenarios of varying complexity for colonoscopy and has robust validity evidence in the context of novices.<sup>21,22</sup>

#### **Experimental Design**

#### (1) Baseline questionnaires

Participants will complete a questionnaire to collect baseline demographic information, including age, sex, level of training, and previous endoscopic experience. Questions regarding experience with team sports and video games will also be included, as these may correlate with baseline endoscopic skil<sup>23</sup> (**Appendix 1**). Additionally, scales assessing the following variables will be administered: (1) competitiveness (Revised Competitiveness Index, **Appendix 2**); (2) self-efficacy (adapted General Self-Efficacy Scale, **Appendix 3**); and (3) game-type personality (Gamified User Personality Hexad, **Appendix 4**). All the included scales have good validity evidence.<sup>24–26</sup>

#### (2) Pre-test

Participants will complete a series of assessments prior to training to assess (1) their baseline knowledge of colonoscopy (knowledge test); (2) technical skills (VR simulation test); and (3) non-technical skills (VR simulation "integrated scenario" test). No feedback will be provided at any point during these assessments.

- Knowledge Test: A 30-minute, 17 item multiple choice question (MCQ) test designed to assess core concepts related to colonoscopy, including indications, pathology, and theory underpinning non-technical skills (Appendix 5).
- VR Simulation Test: A colonoscopy procedure on the VR simulator with a time limit of 30 minutes. Baseline technical proficiency will be assessed by an expert endoscopist. The procedure will be video-recorded, with identifying features hidden, to allow for a blinded assessment at a later time.<sup>27</sup>
- 3. *VR Simulation "Integrated Scenario" Test:* A test in which participants will complete a colonoscopy procedure on the VR simulator in a naturalistic setting (i.e., endoscopy suite) while interacting with a standardized nurse and standardized patient.<sup>28</sup> Trainees will be expected to take a brief patient history and obtain informed consent. The trainee will then carry out the procedure (EndoVR® Module 3 Polypectomy) as described above while responding to the patient and interacting with the nurse as appropriate. As in the technical test, performance will be assessed in real time and videotaped, ensuring anonymity is preserved.

#### (3) Training intervention

Following the pre-tests, participants will be randomized to one of two training groups, following a 1:1 allocation distribution using an online randomization algorithm, by one author (RK). The allocation sequence will be concealed with sealed envelopes. Participants will be assigned to groups by another author (MP). Investigators will be blinded to group allocation.

1. Conventional Curriculum (controls): The control group will receive a total of four, one-hour, small-group teaching sessions covering the theory of colonoscopy, including pathology, anatomy, and therapeutic technique. One session is dedicated to non-technical skills relevant to endoscopy (situation awareness, decision making, communication, teamwork, and leadership) and how they relate to clinical performance. In this session, participants will watch a video demonstrating ideal endoscopic non-technical skills and learn about the Endoscopic Non-Technical Skills (E-NTS) checklist which will be provided for them to use during the integrated scenario training (Appendix 6). This checklist was developed in accordance with evidence-based recommendations, and outlines key endoscopic nontechnical skills.<sup>29</sup> Following each teaching session, a short MCQ test on the topics covered in that session will be administered, in keeping with the "test-enhanced learning" literature. In addition to teaching sessions, the control group will be given a total of six hours of expertassisted instruction on both the bench top simulator (1 hour) and the VR simulator (5 hours). Six modules of increasing difficulty in colonoscopy will be taught with one-on-one feedback from an expert academic endoscopist. The instructor will demonstrate techniques, answer questions and provide individualized performance feedback with a focus on non-technical skills. The last two hours of training on the VR simulator will consist of integrated scenarios, which feature a standardized patient and nurse. Following each scenario, the instructor will

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36

37 38

39

40

41 42

43

44

45

46

47 48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56 57 58

#### BMJ Open

debrief the trainee on their performance, using the "E-NTS Checklist" as a framework for discussing their non-technical skills.

2. Gamified Curriculum (GC): This group will receive the same 4 hours of small group teaching and 6-hours of hands-on simulator training. Within the context of the teaching sessions and simulator training, the gamified curriculum will incorporate the following game design elements: a game narrative; performance tracking measures; and rewards. First, a game narrative will underlie the delivery of the gamified curriculum. Participants will be assigned an avatar and will be tasked with completing a journey of the avatar around a game-board shaped like the colon (Appendix 7) with the goal of reaching the final destination, the terminal ileum. Second, performance tracking measures will be used to allow participants to gauge their performance over time. These measures will be summarized on a leaderboard, which will include 4 components: a non-technical skills score; a technical skills score; a cognitive skills score; and an overall ranking, which will be determined through an algorithm that accounts for non-technical, technical and cognitive scores. Scoring of the non-technical and technical skills will be based on assessed performances during practice sessions on the VR simulator using the Modified Objective Structured Assessment of Non-Technical Skills (MOSANTS) (Appendix 8) and the Joint Advisory Group for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy's Direct Observation of Procedural Skills (JAG DOPS) tool (Appendix 9), respectively. Scoring of cognitive skills will be based on MCQ test scores from the teaching sessions. Scores will be aggregated on the leaderboard for participants training on the same days. The leaderboard will be presented to participants after they finish each hour of practice. Finally, participants will engage in a system of both short-term and long-term rewards. One short-term reward will involve badges to recognize achievements of procedural benchmarks (e.g. cecal intubation) (Appendix 10). Another short-term reward will be the assignment of a wearable medallion, which will be given to the participant with the highest overall ranking at the end of each hour of practice. The long-term reward will be a low-cost prize (i.e. less than \$25 CAD) given to the participant with the highest overall ranking throughout practice. All three game design elements (game narrative, performance tracking measures, reward system) will be introduced to participants in the gamified curriculum group prior to training with a brief tutorial video. After watching the video, participants will receive an anonymized ID to allow for self-tracking on the leaderboard while keeping individual scores private.

All three game design elements are consistent with recommendations from the gamification and educational literature. In line with self-determination theory, leaderboards are purported to increase users' sense of relatedness, engagement and competence through social comparison, feedback provision and documentation of achievement.<sup>31</sup> The rationale for achievement badges and other rewards is that they serve as visual symbol of attained goals, thus supporting participants' sense of competence and serving to foster external motivation and engagement<sup>31,32</sup>. Finally, game narratives are thought to enhance engagement through the integration of meaning and interaction.<sup>9</sup> These elements must be carefully calibrated to challenge and engage learners appropriately and to ensure maintenance of learners' intrinsic motivation.<sup>8,15</sup>

#### (4) Post-test

Participants will complete a series of assessments immediately after training (immediate posttest). These will assess: (1) knowledge acquisition; (2) technical skills acquisition; and (3) non-technical skills acquisition. They will include the same *Knowledge Test*, *VR Simulation Test*, and *VR Simulation "Integrated Scenario" Test* that participants will complete during the *Pre-test*.

#### (5) Delayed testing (Retention and Transfer)

Participants will complete a series of assessments 4 to 6 weeks after training to assess their retention and transfer of skills. These will assess the following: (1) knowledge retention; (2) technical skills retention; (3) non-technical skills retention; and (4) transfer of skills to the clinical environment. They will include the same *Knowledge Test*, *VR Simulation Test*, and *VR Simulation "Integrated Scenario" Test* that participants will complete during the *Pre-test* and the *Post-test*. To assess for transfer of skills to the clinical environment, participants will also complete two live colonoscopies on real patients. These procedures will be videotaped in a manner that anonymizes the identity of the participant and the patient. Procedures on

patients with a history of colonic or pelvic surgery or difficult colonoscopy will be excluded. Sedation and monitoring will be carried out according to standard practices on the endoscopy unit. An experienced attending endoscopist (completed > 500 previous colonoscopies) will provide verbal and/or hands-on assistance as necessary and take over if the participant cannot complete the procedure, or if any concerns regarding patient safety arise.

#### Primary outcome measure

The primary outcome measure is clinical performance during two live colonoscopies 4 to 6 weeks after training, as assessed by the JAG DOPS.<sup>33</sup>. Each clinical colonoscopy will be independently assessed by two experienced endoscopists who will be blinded to group assignment. One rater will be present during the procedure and the other rater will assess the participant's performance using the video-recorded procedure. Video-based assessment of endoscopic performances has been shown to have good validity evidence, compared to live assessment.<sup>27</sup>

#### Secondary outcome measures

- 1. Knowledge acquisition, as assessed by the MCQ Knowledge Tests
- 2. Technical skills acquisition during the VR Simulation Tests, as assessed by the JAG DOPS (Appendix 9)
- Non-technical skills acquisition during the Integrated Scenario Test, as assessed by the Modified Objective Structured Assessment of Non-Technical Skills (M-OSANTS) for colonoscopy, which has good validity evidence for surgery and was modified for endoscopy<sup>5</sup> (Appendix 8)
- Patient comfort during the clinical colonoscopies, as assessed by the endoscopy nurses using the Nurse-Assessed Patient Comfort Score (NAPCOMS)<sup>34</sup> (Appendix 11)
- Participant self-efficacy after each simulated and clinical colonoscopy testing procedure, as measured by an adapted General Self-Efficacy Scale<sup>25</sup> (Appendix 3)
- Cognitive load after each simulated and clinical colonoscopy testing procedure, as measured by the Cognitive Load Scale for Colonoscopy<sup>35</sup> (Appendix 12)
- Participant competitiveness after each simulated and clinical colonoscopy testing procedure, measured using the Revised Competitiveness Index<sup>24</sup> (Appendix 2).

Experienced endoscopists will assess participants' technical skills and non-technical skills during the pre-training, immediate and delayed post-training simulation-based assessments.

#### Data Management

Data will be collected through paper forms directly from assessors. Data from the forms will be extracted and input into a database on a password-protected computer. There is no requirement for a data monitoring committee as this is not a trial addressing the efficacy of a treatment nor is patient safety at risk. Details with respect to protection of confidentiality of participant data is outlined in the participant and patient consent forms (**Appendix 13**, **Appendix 14**).

#### Analysis Plan

Statistical analyses will be performed using SPSS version 20 (SPSS, Inc, Chicago, IL). Alpha for all statistical tests will be set at 0.05.

**Baseline Questionnaire:** Participant baseline variables will be characterized with descriptive statistics, using mean with standard deviation for continuous variables and number frequency for categorical variables, respectively.

*Clinical Performance:* Performance during the live colonoscopies will be compared between the two groups using the JAG DOPS, NAPCOMS, and MOSANTS scores. A mixed factor 2 (Gamified vs. Conventional Curriculum) x 2 (procedure 1 vs. procedure 2) analysis of variance (ANOVA) will be used. ANOVA differences significant at P < 0.05 will be further analyzed using Tukey honestly significant difference (HSD) post hoc tests.

**Technical Performance**: Differences in technical skills acquisition on the simulator will be determined by comparing JAG DOPS scores between groups. Specifically, a mixed factor 2 (Gamified vs. Conventional Curriculum) x 3 (pre-test, post-test, retention test) ANOVA with

Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests will be conducted.

*Non-Technical Skill Performance:* Differences in non-technical skills acquisition on the simulator will be determined by comparing MOSANTS scores. A mixed factor 2 (Gamified vs. Conventional Curriculum) x 3 (pre-test, post-test, retention test) ANOVA with Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests will be conducted.

**Competitiveness:** Baseline competitiveness, as measured by the Revised Competitiveness Index and the Gamification User Types Hexad, will be compared between groups using an independent t-test for each index.

**Self-efficacy:** Differences in self-efficacy between groups will be determined by comparing General Self-Efficacy Scale scores. A mixed factor 2 (Gamified vs. Conventional Curriculum) x 2 (pre-course vs. post- course) ANOVA with Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests will be conducted.

**Cognitive Load:** Differences in cognitive load between groups will be determined by comparing Cognitive Load Index of Colonoscopy scores. A mixed factor 2 (Gamified vs. Conventional Curriculum) x 2 (pre-course vs. post- course) ANOVA with Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests will be conducted.

**Overall:** A mediation analysis using a path-analytic framework will be conducted to determine the interaction of the explanatory variables on the clinical performance between the two groups.<sup>36</sup>

#### Sample size estimation

Since there are no prior studies investigating a gamified curriculum for procedural learning, we conducted the power analysis based on the effect size from a previous study that evaluated an SBT curriculum for endoscopy.<sup>3</sup> Based on an effect size of 1.0 (Cohen's d), an alpha of 0.05 (two-tailed), a beta of 0.20, 2 groups, and 3 measurements, a minimum of 17 participants will be required to achieve a power of greater than 0.80 using repeated measures ANOVA (between-factors). To accommodate for a potential 10% dropout and/or non-response, we will recruit a total of 36 participants.

#### **Ethics and Dissemination**

Research ethics approval was granted by the St. Michael's Hospital Research Ethics Board (17-092). Protocol version 1.0, dated March 23, 2017, was approved. If any protocol modifications are needed, they will be made after communication with the research ethics board and will be detailed in any subsequent publications. Informed consent will be obtained from endoscopist participants and patients on whom participants will perform colonoscopies by one author (MAS). No personal health data on patients will be collected. All authors will have access to trial data. We will disseminate the results of the study through peer-reviewed publication in journals and at scientific meetings. We do not plan to make participant-level data publicly available. The trial is registered at clinicaltrials.gov NCT03176251

#### Feasibility

To date, 21 participants have been recruited, randomized and have completed the study. Data collection is ongoing and is intended to reach completion by August 2018. Subsequent data analysis, manuscript writing and submission for publication are anticipated to reach completion by July 2019.

#### Conclusion

The use of SBT for procedural skills training is widespread. In the report commissioned by the Future of Medical Education in Canada Postgraduate Project, the authors conclude that "simulation... needs to be integrated more thoughtfully into postgraduate curricula."<sup>37</sup> We aim to respond to this call through the development of an SBT curriculum grounded in educational theory. The strengths of this study lie in its randomized design and incorporation of various game design elements into the curriculum. Additionally, the primary outcome is measured in the clinical setting by two blinded expert assessors using an assessment tool with strong

validity evidence. Finally, participants will be assessed both immediately after training for skill acquisition, and 4-6 weeks after training to evaluate skill retention and skill transfer to the clinical environment. The limitations of this study include the significant human resources required to track participants' game metrics and adjust leaderboards.

#### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank David Rojas for his input regarding the implementation of gamification

...

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

60

#### REFERENCES

- 1. Walsh CM, Sherlock ME, Ling SC, Carnahan H. Virtual reality simulation training for health professions trainees in gastrointestinal endoscopy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2012;6(6):CD008237. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD008237.pub2.
- Singh S, Sedlack RE, Cook DA. Effects of Simulation-Based Training in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2014;12(10):1611-1623.e4. doi:10.1016/j.cgh.2014.01.037.
- 3. Grover SC, Garg A, Scaffidi MA, et al. Impact of a simulation training curriculum on technical and nontechnical skills in colonoscopy: a randomized trial. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2015;82(6):1072-1079. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2015.04.008.
- Grover SCSC, Scaffidi MAMA, Khan R, et al. Progressive Learning in Endoscopy Simulation Training Improves Clinical Performance: A Blinded Randomized Trial. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2017;86(5). doi:10.1016/j.gie.2017.03.1529.
- 5. Dedy NJ, Bonrath EM, Ahmed N, Grantcharov TP. Structured Training to Improve Nontechnical Performance of Junior Surgical Residents in the Operating Room. *Ann Surg.* 2016;263(1):43-49. doi:10.1097/SLA.00000000001186.
- 6. Young OM, Parviainen K. Training obstetrics and gynecology residents to be effective communicators in the era of the 80-hour workweek: a pilot study. *BMC Res Notes*. 2014;7:455. doi:10.1186/1756-0500-7-455.
- Walsh CM, Ling SC, Khanna N, et al. Gastrointestinal endoscopy competency assessment tool: Reliability and validity evidence. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2015;81(6):1417-1424.e2. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2014.11.030.
- 8. Rutledge C, Walsh CM, Swinger N, et al. Gamification in action: Theoretical and practical considerations for medical educators. *Acad Med.* 2018:1. doi:10.1097/ACM.00000000002183.
- 9. Deterding S, Dixon D, Khaled R, Nacke L. From game design elements to gamefulness: defining gamification. In: *Proceedings of the 15th International Academic MindTrek Conference: Envisioning Future Media Environments*. ACM; 2011:9-15.
- 10. Yunyongying P. Gamification: Implications for Curricular Design. *J Grad Med Educ*. 2014;6(3):410-412. doi:10.4300/JGME-D-13-00406.1.
- 11. Almarshedi A, Wanick V, Wills GB, Ranchhod A. Gamification and Behaviour. In: Steiglitz S, Lattemann C, Robra-Bissantz S, Zarnekow R, Brockmann T, eds. *Using Game Elements in Serious Contexts*. Springer; 2017:19-30. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-45557-0.
- Edwards EA, Lumsden J, Rivas C, et al. Gamification for health promotion: systematic review of behaviour change techniques in smartphone apps. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(10):e012447. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012447.
- 13. Johnson D, Deterding S, Kuhn KA, Staneva A, Stoyanov S, Hides L. Gamification for health and wellbeing: A systematic review of the literature. *Internet Interv.* 2016;6:89-106. doi:10.1016/j.invent.2016.10.002.
- 14. Sardi L, Idri A, Fernández-Alemán JL. A systematic review of gamification in e-Health. *J Biomed Inform.* 2017;71(May):31-48. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2017.05.011.
- McCoy L, Lewis JH, Dalton D. Gamification and Multimedia for Medical Education: A Landscape Review. J Am Osteopath Assoc. 2016;116(1):22-34. doi:10.7556/jaoa.2016.003.
- 16. MacKinnon RJ, Stoeter R, Doherty C, et al. Self-motivated learning with gamification improves infant CPR performance, a randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Simul Technol Enhanc Learn*. 2015;1(3):71-76. doi:10.1136/bmjstel-2015-000061.
- 17. Hashimoto DA, Gomez ED, Beyer-Berjot L, et al. A Randomized Controlled Trial to Assess the Effects of Competition on the Development of Laparoscopic Surgical Skills. *J Surg Educ.* 2015;72(6):1077-1084. doi:10.1002/dev.21214.Developmental.
- Khan R, Scaffidi MA, Walsh CM, et al. Simulation-Based Training of Non-Technical Skills in Colonoscopy: Protocol for a Randomized Controlled Trial. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2017;6(8):e153. doi:10.2196/resprot.7690.
- 19. Chan W, Tetzlaff J, Altman D, et al. SPIRIT 2013 Statement: Defining Standard Protocol Items for Clinical Trials. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013;158(3):200-207. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-158-3-201302050-00583.
- 20. Walsh CM, Coopper MA, Rabeneck L, Carnahan H. Bench-top versus virtual reality
  - For peer review only http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

**BMJ** Open

21.	simulation training in Endoscopy: Expertise discrimination. <i>CAME</i> . 2008. Ekkelenkamp VE, Koch AD, de Man RA, Kuipers EJ, Man RA De, Kuipers EJ.
	Training and competence assessment in GI endoscopy: a systematic review. <i>Gut.</i> 2015:0(4):1-9. doi:10.1136/gutinl-2014-307173.
22.	Triantafyllou K, Lazaridis LD, Dimitriadis GD. Virtual reality simulators for
	gastrointestinal endoscopy training. <i>World J Gastrointest Endosc</i> . 2014;6(1):6-12.
23.	Van Dongen KW, Verleisdonk EJMM, Schijven MP, Broeders IAMJ. Will the
	Playstation generation become better endoscopic surgeons? Surg Endosc Other
24	Interv Tech. 2011;25(7):2275-2280. doi:10.1007/s00464-010-1548-2.
27.	<i>Psychol Rep.</i> 2010;106(3):870-874. doi:10.2466/pr0.106.3.870-874.
25.	Pena G, Altree M, Field J, et al. Surgeons' and trainees' perceived self-efficacy in
	operating theatre non-technical skills. Br J Surg. 2015;102(6):708-715.
26.	Tondello GF, Wehbe RR, Diamond L, Busch M, Marczewski A, Nacke LE. The
	Gamification User Types Hexad Scale. Proc 2016 Annu Symp Comput Interact Play -
27	CHI Play 16, 2016:229-243, doi:10.1145/2967934.2968082. Scaffidi MA Grover SC, Carnahan H, et al. A Prospective Comparison of Live and
27.	Video-Based Assessments of Colonoscopy Performance. <i>Gastrointest Endosc</i> .
00	2017;87(3):688-694.e2. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2017.08.020.
28.	exploring the feasibility of an Integrated Procedural Performance Instrument (IPPI)
	Med Educ. 2006;40:1105-1114. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02612.x.
29.	Hales BM, Pronovost PJ. The checklist-a tool for error management and performance
30.	Haynie WJ. Effects of test taking on tetention learning in technology education : A
	meta-analysis. J Technol Educ. 2007;18(2):24-36.
31.	Huang B, Hew KF. Do points, badges and leaderboards increase learning and activity:
	2015;(December):275-280.
32.	Gnauk B, Dannecker L, Hahmann M. Leveraging gamification in demand dispatch
	systems. Proc 2012 Jt EDB1/ICD1 Work - EDB1-ICD1 12. 2012:103. doi:10.1145/2320765.2320799
33.	Barton JR, Corbett S, Vleuten CP Van Der, Bowel E. The validity and reliability of a
	Direct Observation of Procedural Skills assessment tool : assessing colonoscopic
	doj:10.1016/i.gie.2011.09.053.
34.	Rostom A, Ross ED, Dubé C, et al. Development and validation of a nurse-assessed
	patient comfort score for colonoscopy. Gastrointest Endosc. 2013;77(2):255-261.
35.	Sewell JL, Boscardin CK, Young JQ, et al. Measuring cognitive load during procedural
	skills training with colonoscopy as an exemplar. <i>Med Educ</i> . 2016;50(6):682-692.
36.	Montova AK. Haves AF. Two-condition within-participant statistical mediation analysis:
	A path-analytic framework. <i>Psychol Methods</i> . 2017;22(1):6-27.
37	doi:10.1037/met0000086. LeBlanc VR_Bould MD_McNaughton N_Brydges R_Piquette D_Sharma B_ <i>Simulation</i>
07.	in Postgraduate Medical Education.; 2011.

1 2 3 4 5 6	FIGURES Figure 1: Study design.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	
23 24 25 26 27 28 29	
30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37	
38 39 40 41 42 43 44	
45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52	
53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60	For peer review only - http://bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtn

**BMJ** Open



195x198mm (144 x 144 DPI)

APPENDIX I: BASELINE QUESTIONNAIRE Participant ID Number:	2	
BASELINE QUESTIONNAIRE         Participant ID Number:         1) Sex:       □ Female         2) Age:	3	APPENDIX I:
S       Participant ID Number:	4	BASELINE QUESTIONNAIRE
<pre> i Sex:</pre>	5	Participant ID Number:
2) Age:	6	1) Sev:
<ul> <li>a) Handedness: Right Ambidextrous</li> <li>b) Year of graduation from Medical School:</li></ul>	/	$2) \Lambda_{ac}$
<ul> <li>a) haldedness. TRight Thetit Traindexitods</li> <li>4) Year of graduation from Medical School:</li></ul>	8	2) Aye
<ul> <li>4) Year of graduation from Medical School:</li></ul>	9	3) Handedness: I Right I Leit I Ambidextrous
<ul> <li>b) Programme:</li> <li>Adult Gastroenterology</li> <li>Pediatric Gastroenterology</li> <li>General Surgery</li> <li>Other (please specify:)</li> <li>c) Level of training:</li> <li>PGY 1</li> <li>PGY 2</li> <li>PGY 3</li> <li>PGY 4</li> <li>PGY 5</li> <li>Other (please specify:)</li> <li>c) Do you have previous experience in playing video games? PYes</li> <li>No</li> <li>If yes, please specify:</li> <li>(a) How many hours do you play on average per week?)</li> <li>b) What types of games do you play? Sports</li> <li>Rele-playing</li> <li>Rel-time strategy Other (please specify:</li> <li>(b) What types of games do you play? Sports</li> <li>Role-playing</li> <li>Real-time strategy Other (please specify:</li> <li>(c) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li></ul>	10	4) Year of graduation from Medical School:
□       Adult Gastroenterology         □       Pediatric Gastroenterology         □       Cother (please specify:	12	5) Programme:
<ul> <li>□ Pediatric Gastroenterology</li> <li>□ General Surgery</li> <li>□ Other (please specify:)</li> <li>6) Level of training:</li> <li>□ PGY 1</li> <li>□ PGY 2</li> <li>□ PGY 3</li> <li>□ PGY 5</li> <li>□ Other (please specify:)</li> <li>7) Do you have previous experience in playing video games? □ Yes</li> <li>□ No</li> <li>??</li> <li>7) Do you have previous experience in playing video games? □ Yes</li> <li>□ No</li> <li>??</li> <li>??</li></ul>	12	Adult Gastroenterology
□ Other (please specify:	14	Pediatric Gastroenterology
16       □ Other (please specify:	15	General Surgery
<ul> <li>6) Level of training:</li> <li>PGY 1</li> <li>PGY 2</li> <li>PGY 3</li> <li>PGY 4</li> <li>PGY 5</li> <li>Other (please specify:)</li> <li>7) Do you have previous experience in playing video games?</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>If yes, please specify:</li> <li>(a) How many hours do you play on average per week?</li> <li>(b) What types of games do you play?</li> <li>Sports</li> <li>Role-playing</li> <li>Real-time strategy</li> <li>Other (please describe)</li> <li>8) Do you have previous experience in performing gastrointestinal endoscopy in the clinical or simulated</li> <li>setting?</li> <li>Yes</li> <li>Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li></ul>	16	□ Other (please specify: )
<ul> <li>PGY 1</li> <li>PGY 2</li> <li>PGY 3</li> <li>PGY 4</li> <li>PGY 5</li> <li>Other (please specify:)</li> <li>7) Do you have previous experience in playing video games?Yes</li> <li>No</li> <li>If yes, please specify:</li> <li>(a) How many hours do you play on average per week?</li> <li>(b) What types of games do you play?Sports</li> <li>Role-playingReal-time strategyOther (please describe)</li> <li>8) Do you have previous experience in performing gastrointestinal endoscopy in the clinical or simulated setting (attempted or completed):</li></ul>	17	6) Level of training:
<ul> <li>PGY 2</li> <li>PGY 3</li> <li>PGY 4</li> <li>PGY 5</li> <li>Other (please specify:)</li> <li>7) Do you have previous experience in playing video games?  Yes</li> <li>No</li> <li>If yes, please specify: <ul> <li>(a) How many hours do you play on average per week?</li> <li>(b) What types of games do you play?  Sorts  Role-playing</li> <li>Rele-playing</li> <li>Read-strength of the clinical or simulated</li> <li>setting?  Yes  No</li> </ul> </li> <li>8) Do you have previous experience in performing gastrointestinal endoscopy in the clinical or simulated setting (attempted or completed):</li></ul>	18	$\square PGY 1$
0       □ PGY 3         1       □ PGY 3         1       □ PGY 4         1       □ PGY 5         1       ○ Uhave previous experience in playing video games? □ Yes         1       □ No         1       f yes, please specify:         (a)       How many hours do you play on average per week?         (b)       What types of games do you play? □ Sports □         1       Role-playing         1       Real-time strategy □ Other         (please describe)       8)         8)       Do you have previous experience in performing gastrointestinal         endoscopy in the clinical or simulated         setting?       □ Yes □ No         16       yes, please specify:         (c)       Number of previous upper endoscopies in the clinical setting         (attempted or completed):	19	
<ul> <li>PGY 4</li> <li>PGY 4</li> <li>PGY 5</li> <li>Other (please specify:)</li> <li>7) Do you have previous experience in playing video games? Pres</li> <li>No</li> <li>If yes, please specify:</li> <li>(a) How many hours do you play on average per week?</li> <li>(b) What types of games do you play? Sports</li> <li>Role-playing</li> <li>Real-time strategy Other (please describe)</li> <li>8) Do you have previous experience in performing gastrointestinal endoscopy in the clinical or simulated setting?</li> <li>(c) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li></ul>	20	
<ul> <li>PGT 4</li> <li>PGT 5</li> <li>Other (please specify:</li></ul>	21	
<ul> <li>Context (please specify:)</li> <li>Context (please specify:</li></ul>	22	DPG14
24       □ Other (please specify:)         25       7) Do you have previous experience in playing video games? □ Yes         27       If yes, please specify:         28       (a) How many hours do you play on average per week?         29       (b) What types of games do you play? □ Sports □         30       (b) What types of games do you play? □ Sports □         31       Role-playing         32       □ Real-time strategy □ Other         33       (please specify:         34       8) Do you have previous experience in performing gastrointestinal         35       endoscopy in the clinical or simulated         36       setting? □ Yes □ No         37       If yes, please specify:         38       If yes, please specify:         40       (c) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the clinical setting         41       (d) Number of previous colonoscopies in the simulated setting         42       (e) Number of previous colonoscopies in the simulated setting         43       (f) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the simulated setting         44       (g) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the simulated setting         45       (g) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the simulated setting         46       (f) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the simulated setting </th <td>23</td> <td></td>	23	
<ul> <li>7) Do you have previous experience in playing video games? Yes</li> <li>No</li> <li>If yes, please specify: <ul> <li>(a) How many hours do you play on average per week?</li> <li>(b) What types of games do you play? Sports</li> <li>Role-playing</li> <li>Real-time strategy Other (please describe)</li> </ul> </li> <li>8) Do you have previous experience in performing gastrointestinal endoscopy in the clinical or simulated setting? Yes No</li> <li>(c) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li></ul>	24	Other (please specify:)
If yes, please specify:         (a)       How many hours do you play on average per week?	25	7) Do you have previous experience in playing video games? D Yes
if yes, please specify:         (a)       How many hours do you play on average per week?         (b)       What types of games do you play?       Sports         (c)       What types of games do you play?       Sports         (c)       What types of games do you play?       Other         (c)       What types of games do you play?       Other         (c)       What previous experience in performing gastrointestinal         endoscopy in the clinical or simulated       setting?       Yes         (c)       Number of previous upper endoscopies in the clinical setting         (d)       Number of previous upper endoscopies in the simulated setting         (d)       Number of previous colonoscopies in the simulated setting         (attempted or completed):	20 27	□ No
<ul> <li>(a) How many hours do you play on average per week?</li></ul>	27	If yes, please specify:
<ul> <li>(b) What types of games do you play? Sports</li> <li>Role-playing</li> <li>Real-time strategy Other (please describe)</li> <li>8) Do you have previous experience in performing gastrointestinal endoscopy in the clinical or simulated setting? Yes No</li> <li>If yes, please specify:</li> <li>(c) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li></ul>	20	(a) How many hours do you play on average per week?
Role-playing       Real-time strategy       Other         Role-playing       Real-time strategy       Real-time strategy         Role-playing       <	30	(b) What types of games do you play?
<ul> <li>Real-time strategy □ Other (please describe)</li> <li>8) Do you have previous experience in performing gastrointestinal endoscopy in the clinical or simulated setting? □ Yes □ No</li> <li>If yes, please specify:</li> <li>(c) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li> <li>(d) Number of previous colonoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li> <li>(e) Number of previous colonoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li> <li>(f) Number of previous colonoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li> <li>(g) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li> <li>(f) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li> <li>(g) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li></ul>	31	Role-plaving
<ul> <li>(please describe)</li> <li>8) Do you have previous experience in performing gastrointestinal endoscopy in the clinical or simulated setting? □ Yes □ No</li> <li>If yes, please specify: <ul> <li>(c) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li></ul></li></ul>	32	Real-time strategy      Other
<ul> <li>8) Do you have previous experience in performing gastrointestinal endoscopy in the clinical or simulated setting? □ Yes □ No</li> <li>If yes, please specify: <ul> <li>(c) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li></ul></li></ul>	33	(please describe)
<ul> <li>andoscopy in the clinical or simulated</li> <li>setting? Yes No</li> <li>If yes, please specify:</li> <li>(c) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting</li> <li>(d) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting</li> <li>(attempted or completed):</li></ul>	34	8) Do you have previous experience in performing gastrointestinal
36       setting?       Yes       No         37       if yes, please specify:       (c)       Number of previous upper endoscopies in the clinical setting         40       (attempted or completed):	35	endoscony in the clinical or simulated
37       If yes, please specify:         38       (c) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the clinical setting         40       (attempted or completed):	36	softing? Des Do
<ul> <li>(c) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting</li> <li>(d) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting</li> <li>(attempted or completed):</li></ul>	37	
<ul> <li>(c) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting</li> <li>(attempted or completed):</li></ul>	38	in yes, please speciny:
<ul> <li>(attempted of completed):</li> <li>(d) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting</li> <li>(attempted or completed):</li> <li>(e) Number of previous colonoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li> <li>(f) Number of previous colonoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting</li> <li>(attempted or completed):</li> <li>(g) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting</li> <li>(attempted or completed):</li> <li>(h) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting</li> <li>(attempted or completed):</li> <li>(i) Number of other <i>clinical</i> GI endoscopy procedures (please specify procedure):</li></ul>	39	(c) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <b>clinical</b> setting
<ul> <li>(d) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li></ul>	40	(attempted or completed):
<ul> <li>(attempted or completed):</li> <li>(e) Number of previous colonoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li> <li>(f) Number of previous colonoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li> <li>(g) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li> <li>(h) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li> <li>(i) Number of other <i>clinical</i> GI endoscopy procedures (please specify procedure):</li> </ul>	41	(d) Number of previous upper endoscopies in the <b>simulated</b> setting
<ul> <li>(e) Number of previous colonoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li></ul>	43	(attempted or completed):
45       or completed):         46       (f) Number of previous colonoscopies in the simulated setting         47       (attempted or completed):         48       (g) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the clinical setting         49       (attempted or completed):         50       (h) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the simulated setting         51       (attempted or completed):         52       (h) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the simulated setting         53       (i) Number of other clinical GI endoscopy procedures (please specify         54       procedure):	44	(e) Number of previous colonoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting (attempted
<ul> <li>(f) Number of previous colonoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li></ul>	45	or completed):
<ul> <li>47 (attempted or completed):</li> <li>48 (g) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li> <li>50 (h) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li> <li>53 (i) Number of other <i>clinical</i> GI endoscopy procedures (please specify procedure):</li> <li>55</li> </ul>	46	(f) Number of previous colonoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting
<ul> <li>(g) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li></ul>	47	(attempted or completed):
<ul> <li>(attempted or completed):</li> <li>(h) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li> <li>(i) Number of other <i>clinical</i> GI endoscopy procedures (please specify procedure):</li> <li>procedure):</li> </ul>	48	(a) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the <i>clinical</i> setting
<ul> <li>(h) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the <i>simulated</i> setting (attempted or completed):</li> <li>(i) Number of other <i>clinical</i> GI endoscopy procedures (please specify procedure):</li> <li>procedure):</li> </ul>	49	(attempted or completed):
<ul> <li>(ii) Humber of provide eignoloceceptee in the childret certaing</li> <li>(attempted or completed):</li> <li>(i) Number of other <i>clinical</i> GI endoscopy procedures (please specify procedure):</li> <li>procedure):</li> </ul>	50	(h) Number of previous sigmoidoscopies in the <b>simulated</b> setting
<ul> <li>(i) Number of other <i>clinical</i> GI endoscopy procedures (please specify procedure):</li> <li>procedure):</li> </ul>	51	(ii) Number of previous signolaescopies in the <b>Simulated</b> setting
53 (i) Number of other <b>Chinical</b> Grendoscopy procedures (please specify 54 procedure): 55 56 57 58 59	52	(i) Number of other <b>clinical</b> CL and according a close an acify
54 procedure): 55 56 57 58 59	53	(i) Number of other <b>chinical</b> of endoscopy procedures (please specily
55 56 57 58 59	54	procedure):
50 57 58 59	55	
57 58 59	50 57	
59	58	
~ .	59	

1 2	
3	
+ 5 6 7	(j) Number of other <i>simulated</i> GI endoscopy procedures (please specify procedure):
8	
9 10	
11 12	
13	
14 15	
16 17	
18	
20	
21 22	
23 24	
25	
27	
28 29	
30 31	
32	
34	
35 36	
37 38	
39	
41	
42 43	
44 45	
46	
48	
49 50	
51 52	
53	
55	
56 57	
58	
60	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

#### BMJ Open

## **Competitiveness Scale**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I like competition	1	2	3	4	5
I am a competitive individual	1	2	3	4	5
I enjoy competing against an	1	2	3	4	5
opponent					
I don't like competing against	1	2	3	4	5
others					
I get satisfaction from	1	2	3	4	5
competing with others					
I find competitive situations	1	2	3	4	5
unpleasant					
I dread competing against	1	2	3	4	5
others	Ň.				
I try to avoid competing with	1	2	3	4	5
others					
I often try to outperform	1	2	3	4	5
others		4.			
I try to avoid arguments	1	2	3	4	5
I will do almost anything to	1	2	3	4	5
avoid an argument					
I often remain quiet rather	1	2	3	4	5
than risk hurting another					
person					
I don't enjoy challenging	1	2	3	4	5
others even when I think they					
are wrong					
In general, I will go along with	1	2	3	4	5
the group rather than create					
conflict					

SELFASSESSMENT RATING FORM - 2017 GI SIMULATION COURSE

### The General Self-Efficacy Scale

Please rate the following items based on a 4-rank scale.

1= Not at all true 2= Hardly true 3= Moderately true 4= Exactly true

	RATING
I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	
If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.	
It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	
I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	
Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	
I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	
I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	
When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	
If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.	
I can usually handle whatever comes my way.	

## **Gamification User Types Hexad Personal Questionnaire**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	More or less agree	Undecided	More or less disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
It makes me happy if I am able to help others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like helping others to orient themselves in new situations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like sharing my knowledge	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The wellbeing of others is important to me	J.C.	2	3	4	5	6	7
	C	~					
Interacting with others is important to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like being part of a team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is important to me to feel like I am part of a community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I enjoy group activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
				0		-	
It is important to me to follow my own path	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I often let my curiosity guide me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
l like to try new things	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Being independent is important to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like defeating obstacles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is important to me to always	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

#### **BMJ** Open

#### SELFASSESSMENT RATING FORM - 2017 GI SIMULATION COURSE

carry out my tasks completely							
It is difficult for me to let go of a problem before I have found a solution	1	2	3	4	5	6	
I like mastering difficult tasks	1	2	3	4	5	6	
I like to provoke	1	2	3	4	5	6	
I like to question the status quo	1	2	3	4	5	6	
I see myself as a rebel	1	2	3	4	5	6	
I dislike following rules	1	2	3	4	5	6	
I like competitions where a prize can be won	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Rewards are a great way to motivate me	1	2	3	4	5	6	
If the reward is sufficient I will put in effort	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Return of investment is important to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	



## Endoscopy Knowledge Post-Test

This is the knowledge test for the University of Toronto endoscopic simulation course. Please type in your "endo" number to begin the test. The test consists of 17 questions for a total of 20 points.

The knowledge questions are on the next two pages. You have 30 minutes to answer these questions.

These answers are confidential, and your responses and score are only for the purposes of our research studies. They will not be used as part of your residency training assessments, or as part of competency assessments.

#### \*Required

- 1. Please type in your "endo" number login to start \*
  - ie, "Endo10"

## Endoscopic Knowledge Test (page 1 of 2)

#### 2. Question 1 (1 point)

Name the endoscopic device depicted below. *Mark only one oval.* 

- 🔵 A. Endoloop
  - ) B. Endoscopic snare
  - C. Endoscopic biopsy forceps
  - ) D. Gold probe
  - ) E. Oval probe



#### 3. Question 2 (1 point)

What type of sigmoid colon loop is most beneficial for entry into the descending colon? *Mark only one oval.* 

- ) A. Alpha-loop
- B. Reverse alpha-loop
- C. Gamma-loop
- ) D. N-loop
- E. Reverse-N loop

#### 4. Question 3 (1 point)

Below is an endoscopic image of the larynx taken with a gastroscope. Which location is representative of the ideal place to position the gastroscope to intubate the esophagus? *Mark only one oval.* 

A	$\bigcirc$	(
В	$\bigcirc$	(
С	$\bigcirc$	(
D	$\bigcirc$	(



#### 5. Question 4 (1 point)

Which of the images below is an endoscopic image of the cecum? *Mark only one oval.* 



For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



#### 6. Question 5 (1 point)

The pit pattern of polyps is commonly used as an endoscopic classification to determine the likely histopathology. What is the name of the classification most commonly used for pit patterns? *Mark only one oval.* 



- A. Kudo classification
- B. Maclean classification
- C. Yoshida classification
- D. Haggitt classification
- E. Sarin classification

#### 7. Question 6 (1 point)

The pit patterns of the polyp depicted below have been enhanced by use of ambient light of bluegreen wavelength (approximately 450 - 540 nm). What is the name of this technology? *Mark only one oval.* 

- A. Confocal microscopy
- B. Optical coherence tomography
- C. Chromoendoscopy
- D. FICE (Fuji intelligent chromoendoscopy)
- ) E. Narrow band imaging

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



#### 8. Question 7 (1 point)

With a well prepared colonoscopy to the cecum performed by an experienced endoscopist, what is the approximate risk of missed advanced neoplasia? *Mark only one oval.* 



	-			
 C.	5-	1	0%	b

D. >10%

#### 9. Question 8 (1 point)

Below is an endoscopic view of a patient's esophagus. What is the endoscopic diagnosis? *Mark only one oval.* 

- A. Eosinophilic esophagitis
  - B. Radiation esophagitis
  - C. Mosaic esophagus
  - ) D. Barrett's esophagus
- E. Diffuse-type squamous cell carcinoma



## Endoscopy knowledge test (page 2 of 2)

#### 10. Question 9 (1 point)

Which of the following is a commonly used bowel preparation score for colonoscopy? *Mark only one oval.* 

- A. Los Angeles bowel preparation score
- ) B. Ottawa bowel preparation score
- C. King's College bowel preparation score
- ) D. Chicago bowel preparation score
- E. Washington bowel preparation score

## **Question 10 (4 points)**

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Endoscopy Knowledge Post-Test



# Identify the labelled parts of the colonoscope head (4 points; 0.5 points each)



https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1ulsNrk5VCb64pBJXX-A35pPvSsblVyayJiZ7rn2Bx4g/edit?ts=58c1a95c

18. **H** 

## **Question 11 (1 point)**

Certain skills necessary for endoscopic performance may be independent of the technical performance of the procedure. Name four non-technical skills that you would view as important in the performance of endoscopic procedures.

### 19. **A**

20.	В		
21.	С		
22.	D		

#### 23. Question 12 (1 point)

Which of the following is not a risk factor for colonic perforation at the time of colonoscopy *Mark only one oval.* 

- 🔵 A. Barotrauma
- B. Mucosal injection
- ) C. Sigmoid looping
- D. Trainee endoscopist performing colonoscopy
- ) E. Resection of sessile polyp

#### Endoscopy Knowledge Post-Test

#### 24. Question 13 (1 point)

A 50 year old patient presents for a screening colonoscopy to your open access endoscopy unit. They have completed a 4L bowel preparation. Upon taking a history, you discover that they had a colonoscopy 2 years ago to work up anorectal bleeding but you don't have the results. What is the appropriate course of action?

Mark only one oval.

A. Complete a screening colonoscopy because the indication of colorectal cancer screening is different than anorectal bleeding.

B. Another screening colonoscopy is not needed; send patient home.

C. Make concerted effort to track down report of prior colonoscopy and if not obtained, then proceed with screening colonoscopy.

D. Make concerted effort to track down report of prior colonoscopy and if not obtained, then explain to patient that they can choose to defer procedure until report is obtained and reviewed

E. Your endoscopic skills exceed that of the previous endoscopist and the procedure must be repeated.

#### 25. Question 14 (1 point)

A unilingual Azerbaijani woman comes in for a gastroscopy to work up epigastric pain. She is unable to understand the consent process, which of the following is most correct? *Mark only one oval.* 

- A. Do a physical examination; if she has abdominal discomfort, continue with gastroscopy.
- B. Ask the patient's daughter to translate the consent form.
- C. Reschedule the gastroscopy and ask her to bring a translator.
- D. Reschedule the gastroscopy and arrange for a translator to accompany her.
- E. Obtain consent from daughter and proceed with procedure

#### 26. Question 15 (1 point)

You are completing a screening colonoscopy and discover a 12 mm pedunculated polyp in the transverse colon. The endoscopy nurse suggests the use of a 10 mm snare and no electrocautery, but you believe a 15 mm snare with electrocautery would be more appropriate. What do you do? *Mark only one oval.* 

A. Take the nurse's suggestion since he/she is more experienced than yourself.



C. Ask the nurse for the rationale for the smaller snare and the absence of cautery and verbalize your decision to proceed with the 15 mm snare with cautery.

D. Discuss with the nurse why you wish to proceed with the larger snare and electrocautery before proceeding with the polypectomy.

	E.	Call	in	а
(	L.	oan		C

E. Call in a colleague to assist in the decision making.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

#### 27. Question 16 (1 point)

You are completing a polypectomy of a 2 cm Paris II-a (flat) polyp in the cecum of a 65 year old male. After the polypectomy you notice a perforation in the cecum. You aim to close the defect with endoclips, start antibiotics, and arrange imaging and possible surgery. Which of the following would not be appropriate? *Mark only one oval.* 

$\overline{}$	A. Start the plan above	e for the management	of the patient's	complication,	as soon as possible.
---------------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------	---------------	----------------------

- B. Inform family members of the procedure's complications before proceeding with the above
- C. Ensure airway, breathing and circulation are intact above all else.
- D. Call for extra assistance into the room as soon as possible.
- ) E. Stay calm as you manage the situation.

#### 28. Question 17 (1 point)

plan.

You perform a screening colonoscopy on an anemic 50 year old male who complains of weight loss, altered bowel habits and blood in his stool. You identify the patient is suffering from colorectal cancer. Which one of the following would not be appropriate in explaining the results of the colonoscopy to the patient?

Mark only one oval.

- A. Ensure the results are delivered in a private setting
- B. Do not inform the patient of the suspected diagnosis until you have the pathology results
- C. Ensure to be empathetic during delivery of the results of the colonoscopy
- D. Establish that the patient understands the results after you explain it to them
- E. Be aware of the patient's reaction and tone as you are delivering the news

## TEAMSTEPPS TEAMWORK ATTITUDES QUESTIONNAIRE

With respect to how each question applies to interactions with a team in ENDOSCOPY, please respond to the questions below by placing a checkmark in the box that corresponds to your level of agreement from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. We realize that the questions may be a little vague but please select only one response for each question.

## **Team Structure**

## 29. 1. It is important to ask patients and their families for feedback regarding patient care before/in/after endoscopy \*

Mark only one oval.

Strong disagree

- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

Page 29,0f-66	
---------------	--

3,392.0f766	Endoscopy Knowledge Post-Test
	30. 2. Patients are a critical component of the care team in surgery and endoscopy *
	Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Disagree
	Neutral
	Agree
	Strongly agree
	31. 3. The Department of Surgery or Division of Gastroenterology influences the success of direct care teams in surgery and endoscopy *
	Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Disagree
	Neutral
	Agree
	Strongly agree
	32. 4. In surgery and endoscopy, the mission of the team is of greater value that the goals of
	Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Disagree
	Neutral
	Agree
	Strongly agree
	33. 5. Effective team members can anticipate the needs of other team members * Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Disagree
	Neutral
	Agree
	Strongly agree

#### 34. 6. High-performing teams in health care share common characteristics with high-performing teams in other industries \*

Mark only one oval.



Strongly agree

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

## Leadership

Neutral
Strongly agree
ders should create informal opportunities for team members to share information *
oniy one oval.
Strong disagree
Disagree
Neutral
Agree
Strongly agree
Strong disagree
Disagree
Neutral
Neutral
Agree
Agree Strongly agree
Agree Strongly agree s a leader's responsibility to model appropriate team behaviour *
Agree Strongly agree s a leader's responsibility to model appropriate team behaviour * only one oval. Strong disagree
Agree Strongly agree s a leader's responsibility to model appropriate team behaviour * only one oval. Strong disagree Disagree
Agree Strongly agree s a leader's responsibility to model appropriate team behaviour * only one oval. Strong disagree Disagree Neutral
Agree Strongly agree s a leader's responsibility to model appropriate team behaviour * only one oval. Strong disagree Disagree Neutral Agree

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

39. 11. It is important for surgeon-leaders or endoscopy-leaders to take time to discuss their team members' plans for each patient *
Mark only one oval.

$\bigcirc$	Strong disagree
$\bigcirc$	Disagree

- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

40. 12. Team leaders should ensure that team members help each other out when necessary \*

Mark only one oval.

- Strong disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

## Situation monitoring

41. 13. Individuals can be taught how to scan the patient environment in the OR or procedure room for important situation cues. \*

Mark only one oval.



- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

# 42. 14. Monitoring patients provides an important contribution to the effective performance of the team \*

Mark only one oval.

- Strong disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

43. <b>15. Ev</b>	Endoscopy thowledge Post-Test
and re	port changes in patient status *
Mark o	only one oval.
$\bigcirc$	Strong disagree
$\bigcirc$	Disagree
$\overline{\bigcirc}$	Neutral
$\overline{\bigcirc}$	Agree
$\bigcirc$	Strongly agree
44. <b>16. lt</b> i	is important to monitor the emotional and physical status of other team members $^{st}$
Mark o	only one oval.
$\bigcirc$	Strong disagree
$\bigcirc$	Disagree
$\bigcirc$	Neutral
$\bigcirc$	Agree
$\bigcirc$	Strongly agree
$\bigcirc$	Strong disagree Disagree
$\bigcirc$	Disaglee
$\bigcirc$	Agree
$\bigcirc$	Strongly agree
$\bigcirc$	
46. <b>18. Te</b>	am members who monitor their emotional and physical status on the job are more ive *
Mark o	only one oval.
$\bigcirc$	Strong disagree
$\overline{\bigcirc}$	Disagree
$\overline{\bigcirc}$	Neutral
$\overline{\bigcirc}$	Agree
$\overline{\bigcirc}$	Strongly agree
N	support

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Pagę	33A	f <sub>7</sub> 66
	/9////	1

33.0f766	Endoscopy Phone Post-Test
	47. 19. To be effective, team members should understand the work of their fellow team members. * Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Disagree
	Neutral
	Agree
	Strongly agree
	48. 20. Asking for assistance from a team member us a sign that that individual does not know how to do his/her job effectively *
	Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Disagree
	Neutral
	Agree
	Strongly agree
	<ul> <li>49. 21. Providing assistance to team members is a sign that an individual does not have enough work to do * Mark only one oval. </li> <li>Strong disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly agree</li></ul>
	50. 22. Offering to help a fellow team member with his/her individual work tasks is an effective tool for improving team performance *
	Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Disagree
	Neutral
	Agree
	Strongly agree

nue to assert a patient safety concern until you are certain th
en team members do not affect patient safety *
en team members do not affect patient safety *
en team members do not affect patient safety *
en team members do not affect patient safety *
en team members do not affect patient safety *
en team members do not affect patient safety *
en team members do not affect patient safety *
en team members do not affect patient safety *
unicate enectively significantly increase their risk of commi
unicate electively significantly increase their fisk of comm
unicate electively significantly increase their fisk of comm
unicate electively significantly increase their fisk of comm
he most common cause of reported errors *
he most common cause of reported errors *
he most common cause of reported errors *
he most common cause of reported errors *
he most common cause of reported errors *
he most common cause of reported errors *
-----
56.
57.
58.

Powered by

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Endos	copist P	articipant ID #:	Date (DD/MM/YYYY):		Start Time:
					End Time:
Assess	sor: Self	-Assessment	VR Simulator (circle one):	1 2	3
VR Ca	SO.				
		·····			
<b>`</b>					
)					
2	ENDC	SCOPIC NON-TECHN	ICAL SKILLS SELF-	REFLE	CTION TOOL
3					V / N
4 5					T / IN
5	1.	Did I take a focused patient hi	story?		
7					
8 9	2.	Did I review the patient's medi allergies?	cations (i.e. anticoagulants)	and	
)	3.	Did I identify the correct proce	dure and take an appropriate	Э	
consent?					
3	4.	Did I discuss the sedation plan	n with the anesthetist or RN?		
4	5	Did Lintroduce the team and n	nyself to the natient?		
5	0.				
.o .7	6.	Did I discuss the procedure with	th the patient and address c	oncerns?	
8	7.	Did Lask the team if they were	e ready to start?		
9					
30 1	8.	Did I situate the patient in the	correct position?		
1 1	9	Did Lverbalize/acknowledge.re	elevant anatomy/landmarks?	)	

9. Did I verbalize/acknowledge relevant anatomy/landmarks?	
10. Did I check vital signs often (every few minutes)?	
11. Did I update the team and patient on the progress of the procedure?	
12. Did I address patient comfort (i.e. ask the patient where pain is) and enact a plan for a patient who was not comfortable?	
13. Did a secondary goal arise during the procedure (e.g. polypectomy)? Did I identify issues and problems that arose from this scenario? Did I verbalize the plan to attend to these?	
14. Did I use closed-loop communication when interacting with the team?	
15. Did I discuss results with the patient post-procedure (i.e. complication, what was found, etc.) and create a follow-up plan?	
16. Was I respectful toward the patient and team?	
17. Did I identify any errors I made afterward? If so what can I do to improve my performance?	







For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

M-OSANTS – NON-TECHNICAL SKILLS							
SITUATIONAL AWARE	NESS: sample que	estions are listed b	oelow, give a globa	l rating.			
1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent			
Was the endoscopist able to Did the endoscopist review p Did the endoscopist demons Did the endoscopist collect a Did the endoscopist recogniz Did the endoscopist anticipat apply loop reduction strategie Was the endoscopist mindful Did the endoscopist ensure t Did the endoscopist anticipat	remain aware of the par rocedural details prior to trate procedural plannin nd use information durin the scope of practice the potential problems du es)? I of procedure time? hat patient outcomes ar the needs of team membe	tient's history (e.g. aller o procedure (e.g. confir g (e.g. identifies objecti ng the procedure (e.g. c (e.g. refrain from unfam ring the procedure while e met (e.g. maintain pa ers and of the patient (e	gies, medications, etc.)' ms correct procedure)? ves for the procedure at hange in vital signs)? hiliar procedures/ interve e proposing suitable sol tient comfort)? e.g. minimize patient and	? t the start)? entions)? utions (e.g. proactively kiety)?			
DECISION MAKING: sa	ample questions ar	re listed below, giv	ve a global rating.				
1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent			
Did the endoscopist identify i Did the endoscopist confider Did the endoscopist demons risk due to polypectomy)? Did the endoscopist account Did the endoscopist appropri Did the endoscopist enact a Did the endoscopist respond assistance from senior staff)	ssues and subsequently tty create a plan and and trate understanding of th for relevant patient infor ately delegate tasks to s subsequent option if init appropriately if the proc	y tailor a plan for resolu ticulate details of the pla ne risks and benefits of rmation (e.g. mindful of staff (e.g. requesting eq ial action unsuccessful? cedure extends out of th	tion (e.g. application of an to the team)? an intervention/ maneur contraindications)? uipment from nurses)? ? ne endoscopist's scope	loop reduction strategies)? ver (e.g. aware of bleeding of practice (e.g. asking for			
COMMUNICATION: sa	mple questions are	e listed below, give	e a global rating.				
1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent			
Was the endoscopist able to receive and respond to information from team members? Did the endoscopist actively limit distractions in the room (e.g. restricts cell phone use)? Did the endoscopist convey information using a closed-loop (e.g. confirms amount of sedation to be administered)? Did the endoscopist speak with clarity, while providing details when appropriate (e.g. requesting snare with specific size)? Did the endoscopist indicate a specific team member if there are multiple staff (e.g. addresses nurse by name)? Did the endoscopist use language appropriate for the recipient (e.g. minimizes medical jargon for patients)? Was the endoscopist aware of verbal tone and volume (e.g. speaks to staff in a respectful, collegial manner that can be heard)? Did the endoscopist ensure that the recipient understands information (e.g. patient comprehends risks)? Did the endoscopist relay findings to patient, including any adverse events (e.g. follow-up during aftercare)?							
LEADERSHIP: sample	questions are liste	ed below, give a gl	obal rating.				
1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent			
Was the endoscopist able to Did the endoscopist direct the nurses attend to patient disco Did the endoscopist demonst bleed)? Did the endoscopist lead the	take responsibility for the flow of the team proce omfort)? trate confidence when le	he process of the proceess ess, including an approp eading the team, even u ://bmjopen.bmj.com/site	dure (e.g. acknowledge briate delegation of labo under pressure (e.g. ma /about/guidelines.xhtml	mistakes)? ur (e.g. requesting that intains composure during a			

1	PROFESSIONALISM: sample questions are listed below, give a global rating.								
2 3	1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent				
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Did the endoscopist demonstrate a respectful and courteous attitude towards the patient and team members (e.g. introduces himself/herself to everyone in the room)?</li> <li>Did the endoscopist acknowledge mistakes during procedure?</li> <li>Did the endoscopist display empathy for the patient (e.g. responds to patient discomfort)?</li> <li>Did the endoscopist advocate on behalf of the patient?</li> <li>Did the endoscopist ensure follow-up and address patient concerns within appropriate environment (e.g. follow-up within offic or dedicated clinical area)?</li> <li>Did the endoscopist refrain from inappropriate conversations (e.g. does not discuss other patients during a procedure)?</li> <li>Did the endoscopist ensure that the procedure adheres to best-practice guidelines (e.g. record quality metrics)?</li> </ul>								
14 15 16	TEAMWORK: sample of	questions are liste	d below, give a glo	bal rating.					
17 18	1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent				
$\begin{array}{c} 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 25\\ 26\\ 27\\ 28\\ 29\\ 30\\ 31\\ 32\\ 33\\ 34\\ 35\\ 36\\ 37\\ 38\\ 39\\ 40\\ 41\\ 42\\ 43\\ 44\\ 45\\ 46\\ 7\\ 48\\ 9\\ 50\end{array}$	Was the endoscopist able to Did the endoscopist demonst Was the endoscopist aware of Did the endoscopist ask for a Did the endoscopist take into	act effectively within the trate respect for all member of the roles of all member willingness to assist othe advice from other team r account feedback from	e team of nurses, techni abers of the team (e.g. s ers of the endoscopic te ers, if appropriate (e.g. v nembers? other team members (	cians, management, an speaks in a collegial, res am? vhen transferring a patie e.g. listens to suggestio	d other physicians? spectful tone)? ent)? ns for equipment)?				
51 52									
53 54 55									
56 57 58									
50 59									

Assessor:	1	Endoscopist Participant ID #:	Date (DD/MM/YYYY):	\$	Star	t Tin	ne:	
Assessor:       VR Simulator (circle one):       1       2       3         VR Case: Polypectomy Case 3       Maximal distance reached (check one):       Rectum       Hepatic Flexure         Sigmoid       Ascending Colon       Cecum         Splenic Flexure       Terminal Ileum         DDPS - TECHNICAL SKILLS         Please write the appropriate score from the scale below         Scale:       4       Highly skilled performance         2       Some standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected         1       Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         1       Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         2       Some standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         1       Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         2       Some standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         3       Computications explained       1       2       3       4         0       Oppointinty for questions       1       2       3       4         0       Oppointinty for questions       1       2       3       4         0       Oppointinty for question       1       2       3       4         0       Oppointinty for que	2 3				End	Tim	ne:	
VR Case: Polypectomy Case 3         Maximal distance reached (check one):       Rectum       Hepatic Flexure         Sigmoid       Ascending Colon         Descending Colon       Cecum         Splenic Flexure       Terminal Ileum         DDPS - TECHNICAL SKILLS         Please write the appropriate score from the scale below         Scale:         Scale:       Highly skilled performance         2       Some standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected         1       Accepted standards not yet met, requent errors uncorrected         1       Accepted standards not yet met, requent errors uncorrected         1       Accepted standards not yet met, requent errors uncorrected         1       Accepted standards not yet met, requent errors uncorrected         0       Obtains informed consent using a structured approach         0       Settistation procedure information         0       Demonstrates respect for patient's views and dignity during the procedure with appropriate management and follow up plan. Full endoscopy report.         2       Safe and secure IV access (or indicates need)       1       2       3         0       Checks endoscop function before intubation (or indicates need to check)       1       2       3         0       Der	4 5	Assessor:	VR Simulator (circle one): 1	2		3		
Maximal distance reached (check one):       Rectum       Hepatic Flexure         Sigmoid       Ascending Colon         Descending Colon       Cecum         Splenic Flexure       Terminal lleum         DOPS – TECHNICAL SKILS         Please write the appropriate score from the scale below         Scale:         4       Highly skilled performance         3       Competent & safe throughout procedure, no uncorrected errors         2       Some standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected         1       Accepted standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected         2       Some standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected         3       Some standards not yet met, spects to be improved, some errors uncorrected         4       Accepted standards not yet met, spects to be improved, some errors uncorrected         5       Some standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         6       Obtains informed consent using a structured approach         5       Satisfactory procedural imformation         6       Opportunity for questions         7       Demonstrates respect for patient's views and dignity during the procedure         1       2       3         6       Side and secute IV acce	6 7	VR Case: Polypectomy Case 3						
9 Maximal distance reached (check one): Rectum Hepatic Flexure 11 Sigmoid Ascending Colon 12 Descending Colon Cecum 13 Splenic Flexure Terminal Ileum 14 DOPS – TECHNICAL SKILLS 15 Please write the appropriate score from the scale below 15 Scale: 4 Highly skilled performance 16 Competent & safe throughout procedure, no uncorrected errors 17 Scale: 4 Accepted standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected 11 Accepted standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected 11 Accepted standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected 12 Competent & safe throughout procedure, no uncorrected errors 2 Some standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected 2 Some standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected 2 Some standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected 2 Some standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected 3 Competent is a structured approach 3 Consent communication 4 Obtains informed consent using a structured approach 5 Setiestcory procedural information 5 Obtains informed consent using a structured approach 5 Setiestcory procedural information 5 Obtains informed consent using a structured approach 5 Setiestcory procedure information 5 Obtains informed consent using a structured approach 5 Setiest of pratient's views and dignity during the procedure information 5 Obtains informed consent using a structured approach 5 Setiest of pratient's views and dignity during the procedure information 6 Communicates clearly with patient (or indicates need) 7 Communicates clearly with patient (or indicates need for monitoring) 7 Demonstrates good communication with the nursing staff, including 7 dosages and vital signs 7 Obtains luminal view / inserts in luminal direction 7 Demonstrates awareness of patient's consciousness and pain during the 7 procedure and takes appropriate action 7 Obtains luminal view / inserts in luminal pressure to aid luminal views 7 Cas a 4 7 Obe	, 8							
Sigmoid       Ascending Colon         Descending Colon       Cecum         Splenic Flexure       Terminal lleum         DOPS – TECHNICAL SKILLS         Scale:       4         Highly skilled performance         Competent & safe throughout procedure, no uncorrected errors         Competent & safe throughout procedure, no uncorrected errors uncorrected         Accepted standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected         Accepted standards, not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         Statistatory procedural information         Bisk and complications explained         • Obtains informed consent using a structured approach         • Statistatory procedural information         • Obtains informed consent using a structured approach         • Statistatory procedural information         • Opportunity for questions         • Opportunity for questions         • Communicates clearly with patient, including outcome of procedure with appropriate management and follow up plan. Full endoscopy report.         Stafe and secure IV access (or indicates need)       1       2       3         • Safe and secure IV access (or indicates need of check)       1       2       3         • Opportunity terguestation       1       2       3       4         • Communication with the nursing staff, i	9 10	Maximal distance reached (check one):	Rectum Hepati	c Flex	ure			
12       Descending Colon       Cecum         13       Splenic Flexure       Terminal Ileum         14       DOPS - TECHNICAL SKILLS         15       Please write the appropriate score from the scale below         16       Scale:       4         17       3       Competent & safe throughout procedure, no uncorrected errors         18       Scale:       4         19       Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         11       Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         12       Satisfactory procedural information         0       Satisfactory procedural information         0       Satisfactory procedural information         0       Satisfactory procedural information         0       Opmonstrates respect for patient's views and dignity during the procedure       1       2       3         12       3       4         13       Communicates clearly with patient, including outcome of procedure with appropriate management and follow up plan. Full endoscopy report.       1       2       3       4         14       Communicates of analgesia and sectation and ensures adequate oxygenation and monitoring of patient (or indicates need to check)       1       2       3       4         12       3	11		Sigmoid Ascene	ding C	olor	l		
Splenic Flexure       Terminal Ileum         DOPS – TECHNICAL SKILLS         Please write the appropriate score from the scale below         Scale:       4       Highly skilled performance         3       Competent & safe throughout procedure, no uncorrected errors         2       Some standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         4       Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         5       Statisticatory procedural information         0       Demonstrates respect for patient's views and dignity during the procedure       1       2       3       4         5       Bask and complications explained       1       2       3       4         0       Obtains informed consent using a structured approach       1       2       3       4         0       Demonstrates respect for patient's views and dignity during the procedure       1       2       3       4         0       Demonstrates respect for patient's views and dignity during the procedure with appropriate management and follow up plan. Full endoscopy report.       1       2       3       4         0       Communication of patient's views and dignity during the procedure with appropriate management and follow up plan. Full endoscopy report.       1       2       3       4         0       Checks and secure IV	12	2	Descending Colon Cecum	ו				
DOPS – TECHNICAL SKILLS         Please write the appropriate score from the scale below         Scale:       4       Highly skilled performance         3       Competent & safe throughout procedure, no uncorrected errors         2       Some standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         1       Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         2       Some standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         3       Compoting to request the terrors uncorrected         4       Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         5       Obtains informed consent using a structured approach         0       Satisfactory procedural information         0       Obtains informed consent using a structured approach         0       Satisfactory procedural information         0       Opportunity or questions         1       2       3         0       Opportunity or questions         1       2       3         2       Safe and secure IV access (or indicates need)       1       2       3         1       2       3       4       2       3       4         2       Safe and secure IV access (or indicates need)       1       2       3       4	12		Splenic Flexure Termin	al lleu	ım			
16 Please write the appropriate score from the scale below         18 Scale:       4       Highly skilled performance         19       3       Competent & Safe throughout procedure, no uncorrected errors         2       Some standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected         1       Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         23       Some standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         1       Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         24       Obtains informed consent using a structured approach         5       Satisfactory procedural information         0       Satisfactory procedural information         1       2       3         2       Opportunity for questions         3       Co-mobility         0       Opportunity for questions         1       2       3         2       Sate and secure IV access (or indicates need)       1       2       3         4       Safe and secure IV access (or indicates need for monitoring)       1       2       3       4         3       Co-mobility       Safe and secure IV access of patient (or indicates need to check)       1       2       3       4         4       Obenostrates avareness of patient scon	15	<u>DC</u>	<u> DPS – TECHNICAL SKILLS</u>					
Scale:       4       Highly skilled performance         3       Competent & safe throughout procedure, no uncorrected errors         2       Some standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected         1       Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         1       Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         2       Some standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         1       Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         2       Somestandards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         3       Obtains informed consent using a structured approach         •       Satistactory procedural information         •       Rake and complications explained       1       2       3       4         •       Communicates respect for patient's views and dignity during the procedure       1       2       3       4         •       Communicates clearly with patient, including outcome of procedure with appropriate management and follow up plan. Full endoscopy report.       1       2       3       4         •       Gives appropriate dose of analgesia and sedation and ensures adequate oxygenation and monitoring of patient (or indicates does, need for monitoring)       1       2       3       4         •       Demonstrates good communication with the nursing staf	16	Please write the appropriate score fro	om the scale below					
19       3       Competent & safe throughout procedure, no uncorrected errors         2       Some standards not yet met, aspects to be improved, some errors uncorrected         21       Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         223       Assessment, consent, communication         244       Assessment, consent, communication         255       • Obtains informed consent using a structured approach         266       • Obtains informed consent using a structured approach         276       • Obtains informed consent using a structured approach         277       • Obtains informed consent using a structured approach         278       • Opportunity for questions         279       • Opportunity for questions         280       • Opportunity for questions         291       • Opportunity for questions         292       • Opportunity for questions         293       • Opportunity for questions         294       • Opportunity for questions         395       • Demonstrates clearly with patient, including outcome of procedure with appropriate management and follow up plan. Full endoscopy report.         294       • Safe and secure IV access (or indicates need)       1       2       3         4       Endoscopic skills       1       2       3       4	18	3 Scale: 4 Highly skilled perform	nance					
22       Some standards not yet met, sapects to be improved, some errors uncorrected         1       Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         CRITERIA         Some standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         Ascepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         Assessment, consent, communication         Noticities as explained         0         Optimize to see of colspan="2">Astention         Accepted standards not yet met, frequent errors uncorrected         Assessment, consent, communication         Optimize to see of consent using a structured approach         Satistadory procedure information         Optimize to see of analgesia and sedation and ensures adequate oxygenation and monitoring of patient (or indicates need to check)       1       2       3       4         Optimize to see of analgesia and sedation and ensures adequate oxygenati	19	<b>3</b> Competent & safe thr	roughout procedure, no uncorrected errors	S			ما	
CRITERIA       SCORE         Assessment, consent, communication       • Obtains informed consent using a structured approach       • Satisfactory procedural information         • Satisfactory procedural information       • Satisfactory procedural information       • I       2       3         • Satisfactory procedural information       • Co-motivity       1       2       3       4         • Communicates respect for patient's views and dignity during the procedure with appropriate management and follow up plan. Full endoscopy report.       1       2       3       4         • Safe and secure IV access (or indicates need)       1       2       3       4         • Safe and secure IV access (or indicates need)       1       2       3       4         • Oberoscitating of patient (or indicates does, need for monitoring)       1       2       3       4         • Oberoscitating of patient (or indicates need to check)       1       2       3       4         • Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)       1       2       3       4         • Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)       1       2       3       4         • Demonstrates awareness of patient's consciousness and pain during the procedure and takes appropriate action       1       2       3       4<	20	1 Accepted standards not	not vet met, frequent errors uncorrected	rors ur	ICOL	ecie	a	
Assessment, consent, communication       JOUNT Link       JOUNT Link         • Obtains informed consent using a structured approach       • Satisfactory procedural information       • Satisfactory procedural information         • Risk and complications explained       • Co-morbidity       1       2       3       4         • Co-morbidity       • Sedation       • Opportunity for questions       1       2       3       4         • Communicates clearly with patient, including outcome of procedure with appropriate management and follow up plan. Full endoscopy report.       1       2       3       4         • Safe and secure IV access (or indicates need)       1       2       3       4         • Gives appropriate dose of analgesia and sedation and ensures adequate oxygenation and monitoring of patient (or indicates need for monitoring)       1       2       3       4         • Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)       1       2       3       4         • Performs/Indicates need for PR       1       2       3       4         • Uses torque steering and control knobs appropriately       1       2       3       4         • Othecks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)       1       2       3       4         • Demonstrates warenees of patient's consciousness and pain d	22				50			1
Obtains informed consent using a structured approach     Satisfactory procedural information     Satisfactory procedural information     Co-morbidity     Sedation     Opportunity for questions     Opportunity for question for indicates deet for monitoring     Opportun	23	Assessment, consent, communic	cation		500			1
<ul> <li>Satisfactory procedural information         <ul> <li>Risk and complications explained</li> <li>Co-motivitity</li> <li>Sedation</li> <li>Co-motivitity</li> <li>Sedation</li> </ul> </li> <li>Demonstrates respect for patient's views and dignity during the procedure with appropriate management and follow up plan. Full endoscopy report.</li> <li>Safety and sedation</li> <li>Safe and secure IV access (or indicates need)</li> <li>Safe and secure IV access (or indicates does, need for monitoring)</li> <li>Demonstrates good communication with the nursing staff, including dosages and vital signs</li> <li>Demonstrates need for PR</li> <li>Performs/Indicates need for PR</li> <li>Performs/Indicates need for PR</li> <li>Uses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately</li> <li>Uses torque steering and control knobs appropriately</li> <li>Uses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Safe and therapeutic ability</li> </ul> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Adecuate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Adecuate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Adecuate mucosal visualization<td>24</td><td>Obtains informed consent using a</td><td>structured approach</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td></li>	24	Obtains informed consent using a	structured approach					1
27 <ul> <li>Risk and complications explained</li> <li>Co-morbidity</li> <li>Sedation</li> <li>Opportunity for questions</li> </ul> <ul> <li>A 2 3 4</li> <li>Communicates respect for patient's views and dignity during the procedure with appropriate management and follow up plan. Full endoscopy report.</li> </ul> <ul> <li>Communicates clearly with patient, including outcome of procedure with appropriate management and follow up plan. Full endoscopy report.</li> <li>Safety and secure IV access (or indicates need)</li> <li>Safe and secure IV access (or indicates need)</li> <li>Safe and secure IV access (or indicates need)</li> <li>Safe and secure IV access (or indicates does, need for monitoring)</li> <li>Demonstrates good communication with the nursing staff, including dosages and vital signs</li> <li>Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)</li> <li>Performs/Indicates need for PR</li> <li>Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)</li> <li>Performs/Indicates need for PR</li> <li>Demonstrates awareness of patient's consciousness and pain during the procedure and takes appropriate action</li> <li>Uses torque steering and control knobs appropriately</li> <li>Uses option change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Safe</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes and logically resolves loop formation</li> <li>Uses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately</li> <li>Safe</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks or incomplete examination</li></ul>	26	<ul> <li>Satisfactory procedural information</li> </ul>						
Second and a second a secon	27	<ul> <li>Risk and complications explained</li> <li>Co-morbidity</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	
<ul> <li>Opportunity for questions</li> <li>Demonstrates respect for patient's views and dignity during the procedure with appropriate management and follow up plan. Full endoscopy report.</li> <li>Safety and sedation</li> <li>Safety and sedation</li> <li>Safet and secure IV access (or indicates need)</li> <li>Gives appropriate dose of analgesia and sedation and ensures adequate oxygenation and monitoring of patient (or indicates does, need for monitoring)</li> <li>Demonstrates good communication with the nursing staff, including dosages and vital signs</li> <li>Demonstrates good communication with the nursing staff, including dosages and vital signs</li> <li>Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)</li> <li>Performs/Indicates need for PR</li> <li>Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)</li> <li>Performs/Indicates need for PR</li> <li>Demonstrates awareness of patient's consciousness and pain during the procedure and takes appropriate action</li> <li>Uses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately</li> <li>Uses position change and addominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Uses position change and addominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>S a 4</li> </ul>	28	<ul> <li>Sedation</li> </ul>						
<ul> <li>Demonstrates respect for patient's views and dignity during the procedure in patient's views and dignity during the procedure and takes appropriate action</li> <li>Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)</li> <li>Demonstrates awareness of patient's consciousness and pain during the procedure and takes appropriate action</li> <li>Uses torque steering and control knobs appropriately</li> <li>Uses gostion change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>Diagnostic and therapeutic ability</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes and inframates comminations appropriately and safely</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	30	• Opportunity for questions						-
<ul> <li>Communicates clearly with patient, including outcome of procedure with appropriate management and follow up plan. Full endoscopy report.</li> <li>Safety and sedation</li> <li>Safe and secure IV access (or indicates need)</li> <li>Gives appropriate dose of analgesia and sedation and ensures adequate oxygenation and monitoring of patient (or indicates does, need for monitoring)</li> <li>Demonstrates good communication with the nursing staff, including dosages and vital signs</li> <li>Demonstrates good communication with the nursing staff, including dosages and vital signs</li> <li>Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)</li> <li>Performs/Indicates need for PR</li> <li>Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)</li> <li>Performs/Indicates need for PR</li> <li>Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)</li> <li>Performs/Indicates need for PR</li> <li>Demonstrates awareness of patient's consciousness and pain during the procedure and takes appropriate action</li> <li>Uses torque steering and control knobs appropriately</li> <li>Uses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>Recognizes and logically resolves loop formation</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	31	Demonstrates respect for patient's	s views and dignity during the procedure	1	2	3	4	-
33       Safety and sedation         34       Safety and sedation         35       Safe and secure IV access (or indicates need)       1       2       3       4         36       Gives appropriate dose of analgesia and sedation and ensures adequate oxygenation and monitoring of patient (or indicates does, need for monitoring)       1       2       3       4         37       Demonstrates good communication with the nursing staff, including dosages and vital signs       1       2       3       4         38       Endoscopic skills       1       2       3       4         41       Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)       1       2       3       4         42       O Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)       1       2       3       4         43       Performs/Indicates need for PR       1       2       3       4         44       Maintains luminal view / inserts in luminal direction       1       1       2       3       4         45       Demonstrates awareness of patient's consciousness and pain during the procedure and takes appropriate action       1       2       3       4         46       Uses torque steering and control knobs appropriately       1       2       3	32	Communicates clearly with patien     appropriate management and foll	it, including outcome of procedure with	1	2	3	4	
<ul> <li>Safe and secure IV access (or indicates need)</li> <li>Gives appropriate dose of analgesia and sedation and ensures adequate oxygenation and monitoring of patient (or indicates does, need for monitoring)</li> <li>Demonstrates good communication with the nursing staff, including dosages and vital signs</li> <li>Endoscopic skills</li> <li>Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)</li> <li>Performs/Indicates need for PR</li> <li>Maintains luminal view / inserts in luminal direction</li> <li>Demonstrates awareness of patient's consciousness and pain during the procedure and takes appropriate action</li> <li>Uses torque steering and control knobs appropriately</li> <li>Uses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately</li> <li>Uses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Uses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Uses contraction and management of pathology</li> <li>MA</li> </ul>	33	Safety and sedation						1
<ul> <li>Gives appropriate dose of analgesia and sedation and ensures adequate oxygenation and monitoring of patient (or indicates does, need for monitoring)</li> <li>Demonstrates good communication with the nursing staff, including dosages and vital signs</li> <li>Endoscopic skills</li> <li>Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)</li> <li>Performs/Indicates need for PR</li> <li>Demonstrates awareness of patient's consciousness and pain during the procedure and takes appropriate action</li> <li>Uses torque steering and control knobs appropriately</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>Seconjizes and logically resolves loop formation</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>Uses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>Diagnostic and therapeutic ability</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks or incomplete examination</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>N/A</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	35	Safe and secure IV access (or indi	icates need)	1	2	3	4	1
37       oxygenation and monitoring of patient (or indicates does, need for monitoring)       1       2       3       4         38       Demonstrates good communication with the nursing staff, including dosages and vital signs       1       2       3       4         41       Endoscopic skills	36	Gives appropriate dose of analgements	sia and sedation and ensures adequate	1	2	3	٨	1
<ul> <li>Demonstrates good communication with the nursing staff, including dosages and vital signs</li> <li>Demonstrates good communication with the nursing staff, including dosages and vital signs</li> <li>Endoscopic skills</li> <li>Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)</li> <li>Performs/Indicates need for PR</li> <li>Maintains luminal view / inserts in luminal direction</li> <li>Demonstrates awareness of patient's consciousness and pain during the procedure and takes appropriate action</li> <li>Uses torque steering and control knobs appropriately</li> <li>Uses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately</li> <li>Uses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately</li> <li>Uses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Madequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks or incomplete examination</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> </ul>	3/	oxygenation and monitoring of pa	tient (or indicates does, need for monitoring)				-	_
40       Endosages and vital signs         41       Endoscopic skills         42       • Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)       1       2       3       4         43       • Performs/Indicates need for PR       1       2       3       4         44       • Maintains luminal view / inserts in luminal direction       1       2       3       4         44       • Demonstrates awareness of patient's consciousness and pain during the procedure and takes appropriate action       1       2       3       4         46       • Uses torque steering and control knobs appropriately       1       2       3       4         47       • Uses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately       1       2       3       4         48       • Uses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views       1       2       3       4         50       • Recognizes not logically resolves loop formation       1       2       3       4         51       • Uses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views       1       2       3       4         52       • Adequate mucosal visualization       1       2       3       4         53       • Adequate mucosal visualization	39	Demonstrates good communication	on with the nursing staff, including	1	2	3	4	
<ul> <li>Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)</li> <li>Checks endoscope function before intubation (or indicates need to check)</li> <li>Performs/Indicates need for PR</li> <li>Maintains luminal view / inserts in luminal direction</li> <li>Demonstrates awareness of patient's consciousness and pain during the procedure and takes appropriate action</li> <li>Uses torque steering and control knobs appropriately</li> <li>Uses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>Recognizes and logically resolves loop formation</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>Uses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks or incomplete examination</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	40	Endoscopic skills						
<ul> <li>Performs/Indicates need for PR</li> <li>Maintains luminal view / inserts in luminal direction</li> <li>Demonstrates awareness of patient's consciousness and pain during the procedure and takes appropriate action</li> <li>Uses torque steering and control knobs appropriately</li> <li>Uses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately</li> <li>Recognizes and logically resolves loop formation</li> <li>Uses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>Diagnostic and therapeutic ability</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks or incomplete examination</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	41	Checks endoscope function befor	e intubation (or indicates need to check)	1	2	3	4	1
<ul> <li>Maintains luminal view / inserts in luminal direction</li> <li>Demonstrates awareness of patient's consciousness and pain during the procedure and takes appropriate action</li> <li>Uses torque steering and control knobs appropriately</li> <li>Uses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately</li> <li>Uses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately</li> <li>Recognizes and logically resolves loop formation</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>Uses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>Diagnostic and therapeutic ability</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks or incomplete examination</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	43	<ul> <li>Performs/Indicates need for PR</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	1
<ul> <li>Demonstrates awareness of patient's consciousness and pain during the procedure and takes appropriate action</li> <li>Uses torque steering and control knobs appropriately</li> <li>Uses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately</li> <li>Uses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately</li> <li>Recognizes and logically resolves loop formation</li> <li>Uses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Uses distension visualization</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks or incomplete examination</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	44	Maintains luminal view / inserts in	luminal direction	1	2	3	4	1
123447oUses torque steering and control knobs appropriately123448oUses torque steering and control knobs appropriately123449oUses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately123450.Recognizes and logically resolves loop formation123451oUses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views123452oCompletes procedure in reasonable time123454Diagnostic and therapeutic ability123455.Adequate mucosal visualization123456.Recognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks or incomplete examination123457.Accurate identification and management of pathology123458.Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely123460	45 46	Demonstrates awareness of patie	nt's consciousness and pain during the	1	2	2	٨	1
<ul> <li>Uses torque steering and control knobs appropriately</li> <li>Uses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately</li> <li>Recognizes and logically resolves loop formation</li> <li>Recognizes and logically resolves loop formation</li> <li>Uses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Uses procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Uses procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks or incomplete examination</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Recognizes and manages/complications/ampropriately and safely</li> <li>Z 3 4</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	47	procedure and takes appropriate	action			3	4	_
<ul> <li>Ouses distension, suction and lens washing appropriately</li> <li>Recognizes and logically resolves loop formation</li> <li>Uses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Ouses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks or incomplete examination</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Recognizes and manages/complications/aminom/site/about/guidelines.xhtml</li> <li>X and manages/complications/aminom/site/about/guidelines.xhtml</li> </ul>	48	• Uses torque steering and control	knobs appropriately	1	2	3	4	_
<ul> <li>Recognizes and logically resolves loop formation</li> <li>Uses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Uses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks or incomplete examination</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Becognizes and management of pathology</li> <li>Recognizes and management of pathology</li> <li>2 3 4</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	49	$\circ$ Uses distension, suction and lens	washing appropriately	1	2	3	4	-
<ul> <li>Ouses position change and abdominal pressure to aid luminal views</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Diagnostic and therapeutic ability</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks or incomplete examination</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Becognizes and manages (complications/amonor) are information (sterabout/guidelines xhtml 2 3 4</li> </ul>	50 51	Recognizes and logically resolves	s loop formation	1	2	3	4	-
<ul> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>Completes procedure in reasonable time</li> <li>2 3 4</li> <li>Diagnostic and therapeutic ability</li> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks or incomplete examination</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Recognizes and management of pathology</li> <li>2 3 4</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	52	• Uses position change and abdom	inal pressure to aid luminal views	1	2	3	4	-
<ul> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks or incomplete examination</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Recognizes and management of satisfic om/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 2</li> </ul>	53	<ul> <li>Completes procedure in reasonal</li> <li>Diagnostia and thereas with a billing</li> </ul>		1	2	3	4	-
<ul> <li>Adequate mucosal visualization</li> <li>Recognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks or incomplete examination</li> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Recognizes and management of pathology</li> </ul>	54		y	4	2	2	1	4
<ul> <li>Accurate identification and management of pathology</li> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Recognizes and management of sathology</li> <li>Recognizes and management of pathology</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	56	Auequate mucosal visualization	ndmarks or incomplete exemination	1	<u>∠</u> 2	<u> </u>	4	-
<ul> <li>Uses diathermy and therapeutic techniques appropriately and safely</li> <li>Recognizes and Friender Vicentifies (complications) and management of pathology</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	57	Accurate identification and management	numarks of incomplete examination	1	<u>~</u> 2	- J - 2	4	-
<ul> <li>60 • Recognizes and Frainades (complications/ amigroom/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 2 3 4 □ N/Δ</li> </ul>	58	Uses diathermy and therapeutic to	echniques appropriately and safely	1	2	3	4	
	60	Recognizes and managed to the second se	cations appropriate com/site/about/guideline	s.xhtml	2	3	4	

#### Appendix X: Badge Table

Requirement Needed	Standardized Hints	Setting	Hour
Complete a case in less than a minute	Complete a case in less than a minute	Low fidelity	Hour 1
Complete Low Fidelity	Complete all Low fidelity cases	Low Fidelity	Hour 1
Proper Torque (as determined by assessor)	Torque properly	Low Fidelity	Hour 1
Less than 10% time in red- out	Be careful how much time in red out you spend.	Intro 3/4	Hour 2
Less than 90% Air left in colon	Remove an appropriate amount of air from the colon	Intro 3/4	Hour 2
Over 90% visualization	Make sure to have enough visualize the colon	Intro ¾	Hour 2
Identify the Ulcerative Colitis	ID a diagnosis	Intro 5	Hour 3
Identify pseudomembranous colitis	ID a diagnosis	Biopsy 3	Hour 3
Successful biopsy of Crohn's patient	Use the biopsy forceps	Poly 4	Hour 3 or 4
Take a Photo of a Pedunculated Polyp	Take photos	Poly 1	Hour 4
Identification of location of Polyp (splenic flexure or _cm in)	Say what you see	Poly 3	Hour 4
Outline major risks in colonoscopy	Pros and Cons	Integrated Scenarios	Hour 5/6
Minimum of 4/5 1. Infection 2. Perforation 3. Missed lesions 4. Sedation complications 5. Bleeding			
Pain acknowledgement (administration of meds, empathetic statement)	"Pain"	Integrated Scenarios	Hour 5/6

4	
5	
6	
/ 8	
9	
10	
11	ŀ
12	
13 14	
15	
16	L
17	
18 10	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30 31	
32	
33	
34	
35 36	
37	
38	
39	
40 41	
41	
43	
44	
45	
46 47	
48	
49	
50	
51 52	
5∠ 53	
55	
55	
56	

No time in extreme Pain	Patient comfort is important	Integrated Scenarios	Hour 5/6
Do an endoscopic Pause	"Pause"	Integrated Scenarios	Hour 5/6
<ol> <li>Indicate a pause</li> <li>Revise case</li> <li>Feedback from SN</li> </ol>			
Retroflex without assistance	"Rectum"	High Fidelity	Any
Intubate the TI	Make sure you finish the whole pathway	High Fidelity	Any

\*Assessors please fill out

#### NURSE ASSESSED PATIENT COMFORT SCORE (NAPCOMS)

Domain	Item	0	1	2	3	Score	
	1- Intensity	None or minimal	Mild	Moderate	Severe		
Pain	2- Frequency	None	Few (1 or 2 episodes)	Several times (3-4 episodes)	Frequent (>4 episodes)		
	3- Duration	None	Short duration (episode <30 seconds)	Moderate duration (30 sec-1 minute)	Long duration (episode lasts >1 min)		
	Total Pain Score (Intensity + Frequency + Duration)						
Sedation	Level of consciousness*	Alert	Sleepy but initiates conversation	Responds only when asked or stimulated	Unresponsive or only responds with pronounced simulation		
Global	Tolerability*	Very well tolerated	Reasonably well tolerated	Just tolerated	Poorly tolerated		

\*Note: level of consciousness and tolerability are not used in overall score

#### Cognitive Load Index for Colonoscopy

CRITERIA	SCORE
<b>Intrinsic load items:</b> Please rate your agreement with the following statements regarding the colonoscopy you've just completed. Please circle from 0 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree)	
1. Physically manipulating and controlling the colonoscope was difficult	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2. Using ancillary instruments (i.e. biopsy forceps, polypectomy snare) was difficult	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3. Identifying normal anatomy and/or landmarks was difficult	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4. The endoscopic findings were complex or difficult to characterize	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
5. It was difficult to manage identified pathology (i.e. polyps that were difficult to remove, bleeding that was difficult to control)	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
6. It was difficult to keep track of, or remember, all the endoscopic findings	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
7. Managing the patient's level of comfort was difficult	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
8. Overall, this colonoscopy was difficult and/or complex	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
<b>Extraneous load items:</b> Please rate your agreement with the following statements regarding your experience during the colonoscopy you've just completed. Please circle from 0 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree)	
1. My supervisor's instructions were unclear	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2. My supervisor used language that was confusing or unfamiliar	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3. The manner in which my superior provided instructions	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4. I felt distracted by other people present in the endoscopy room	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
5. I felt distracted by the environment (i.e. my pager going off, environmental noise)	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
6. I felt distracted by things on my mind unrelated to this colonoscopy	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
<b>Germane load items:</b> Please rate your agreement with the following statements regarding your level of mental effort during the colonoscopy you've just completed. Please circle from 0 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree)	
1. I invested substantial mental effort learning how to control or manipulate the colonoscope and/or other endoscopic equipment	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2. I invested substantial mental effort identifying or understanding colonic anatomy	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3. I invested substantial mental effort understanding, remembering and/or managing the endoscopic findings	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4. I invested substantial mental effort learning how to manage patient comfort level	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
5. Overall, I invested substantial mental effort learning during this colonoscopy	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

## St. Michael's

#### Inspired Care. Inspiring Science.

Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy: impact on clinical performance

#### **CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY**

This is a consent form regarding the above mentioned research study. Before you give your consent to voluntarily participate in this study, it is important that you read the following information and ask the study personnel as many questions as necessary to be sure you understand what you will be asked to do.

#### **Investigators**

Principal Investigator:

Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC Division of Gastroenterology St. Michael's Hospital 16-036 Cardinal Carter Wing 30 Bond Street Toronto, Ontario M5B 1W8 Phone: (416) 864-5628 Fax: (416) 864-5882 E-mail: grovers@smh.ca

#### **Background and Purpose of the Study**

Colonoscopies are medical procedures that gastroenterology physicians and general surgeons learn during their residency training. Traditionally, these procedures are learned for the first time on patients in the clinical setting under the supervision of a fully-trained attending physician. Virtual reality (VR) has since been used to create devices, called endoscopic simulators that can emulate the look and feel of performing colonoscopies, and have been validated in research studies to confer basic skills to trainees. The optimal method to use virtual reality simulators for teaching trainees that have yet to begin procedures in colonoscopy has yet to be determined, and was identified by the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy as a need for further training.

The primary objective of this project is to evaluate the impact of a simulation-based training curriculum using gamification on clinical performance in colonoscopy.

#### <u>Eligibility</u>

You are asked to consider taking part in this study if you are a resident in General Surgery, Adult Gastroenterology or Pediatric Gastroenterology at the University of Toronto.

In order to be eligible for this study, you must be a post-graduate trainee in the above programs, must have completed less than 25 colonoscopic procedures, and must have completed less than 25 simulated colonoscopy procedures to date.

#### **Description of the Study**

We aim to recruit 36 postgraduate novice endoscopists from the Adult Gastroenterology, Pediatric Gastroenterology and General Surgery training programs at the University of Toronto. **Note:** this study takes place concurrently alongside the Annual Endoscopic Simulation Training Course. The study, as described below, is a randomized control trial that is investigating the effectiveness of a new simulation-based curriculum. The Annual Endoscopic Simulation Training Course is an educational program through the University of Toronto, which aims to teach novices how to perform colonoscopies. Participation in the study component is optional; if you chose to opt-out of the study, it <u>will not</u> impact your participation in the course.

You will be asked to take a written questionnaire at the start of the study to collect demographic and background information including: age, sex, level of training, previous endoscopy experience and nature of experience, and video game experience, which may correlate with baseline endoscopic skill.

Following this you will take part in a pre-test consisting of the following:

1. **Knowledge Test:** A 30 minute (17 questions) multiple-choice question test designed to assess participants' theoretical knowledge of colonoscopy, including indications, sedation, safety, findings, pathology and follow-up.

Consent Form, Version Date: September 5, 2017 Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy; impact on clinical performance For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 2. VR Simulation Test: This test will assess baseline endoscopic technical proficiency through the completion of a colonoscopy procedure on the VR simulator (EndoVR® Colonoscopy Module 3). This scenario simulates a screening colonoscopy, without the need for any type of intervention (such as biopsy). The time limit of the procedure will be 30 minutes. An expert rater will be present to assess performance, but will not provide assistance. You will be videotaped in order to obtain performance measures, such that your faces are not captured (to ensure anonymity). Prior to starting the procedure, you will complete a questionnaire to measure self-efficacy.

**3.** VR Simulation Based "Integrated Scenario" Test: Following the simulatoronly test, participants will complete an Integrated Scenario format test to assess their baseline endoscopic non-technical proficiency. This simulated procedure will mimic the setup of an endoscopic suite, as the VR simulator will be positioned next to a patient bed. A standardized patient, who will receive instructions regarding their medical role, will act out a scenario on colon cancer screening. You will be expected to explain the colonoscopy procedure, its benefits and risks, and to obtain procedural consent. You will then carry out the procedure on the VR simulator (EndoVR® Polypectomy Module #3) while responding to the patient and interacting with the standardized nurse (SN) as appropriate. The Standardized Patient (SP) will act out cues from the VR simulator if the simulator signals that the procedure has exceeded its threshold for discomfort. Your performance will be videotaped (in a manner that their faces are not captured to ensure anonymity) in order to obtain performance measures. You will be given a maximum of 45 minutes to complete the procedure.

You will then be randomized, using an online randomization algorithm, to one of two groups:

**Control Group:** This group will receive 4 hours of interactive small-group 1. didactic and hands-on sessions. During these sessions, participants will focus on learning about the theory of colonoscopy, including related concepts of pathology, anatomy, and therapeutic technique. The last session will focus on non-technical skills (NTS) relevant to endoscopy (situation awareness, decision making, communication, teamwork, and leadership) and how they relate to clinical performance. During this session, participants will also watch a video that demonstrates an ideal endoscopic procedure in terms of NTS, as well as learn about the "E-NTS Checklist", which will be provided for them to later use during the integrated scenario training. This checklist has been developed according to evidence-based recommendations and targets non-technical skills. After each didactic session, a short MCQ based on the topics covered in that session will be administered, in keeping with suggestions from the literature regarding "test-enhanced learning". In addition to didactic training, the control group will be given six hours of expert-assisted instruction on both the low-fidelity simulator (1 hour) and on the high-fidelity VR simulator (5 hours). Six modules of increasing difficulty in colonoscopy and colonoscopic polypectomy will be taught using one-on-one feedback from an expert academic endoscopist. The endoscopy instructor will demonstrate techniques, answer

Consent Form, Version Date: September 5, 2017 Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy; impact on clinical performance For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 49 of 66

1

questions and provide individualized performance feedback on global performance, with a focus on non-technical skills. During training on the high-fidelity simulator, the last two hours will take the form of the integrated scenario, which will feature a standardized patient (SP) and standardized nurse (SN). Terminal feedback will be given after each integrated scenario by the instructor. Finally, the "E-NTS Checklist" will be accessible during training in the integrated scenario, as participants can view the checklist prior to each case and review it after the case.

2. **Intervention Group:** This group will receive the same 4 hours of didactic teaching, and hands-on sessions. The intervention group will also receive the same teaching on both the low-fidelity and high-fidelity simulators. Within the context of the didactic sessions and simulator training, the GIC group will engaged in "gamified practice" in two ways. First, leaderboards will also be used to track and rank participants' performances. Prior to training, participants in the GIC group will watch a tutorial video on the functionality of the leaderboards and subsequently receive an anonymized ID tag that can be used to identify only their position on the leaderboard. Participants will also be informed that awards will be given to the individual who achieves first place. An "introductory" leaderboard, based on technical skills performance during the low-fidelity simulator practice, will be used to familiarize participants with the function of the leaderboard. After practice on the low-fidelity simulator is completed, participants will be introduced to the leaderboard for performance on the VR simulator and didactic sessions. Specifically, this leaderboard will include 4 components: a non-technical skills score, a technical skills score, a cognitive skills score, and an overall ranking, which will be determined through an algorithm that accounts for non-technical, technical and cognitive scores. Scoring of the non-technical and technical skills will be based on assessed performances during practice sessions on the VR simulator using the M-OSANTS and JAG-DOPS, respectively, while the scoring of the cognitive skills will be based on percentage scores of the MCO from the didactic sessions. Scores will be aggregated only from participants training on the same days. The leaderboard will be displayed on a central laptop and/or TV screen and will be accessible at any time throughout the day. Finally, participants in the GIC group will have the opportunity to be rewarded for their performances. One method of reinforcing good performance will be through achievement badges. These badges will be awarded after each scenario on the high-fidelity simulator and will be based on completion, proper technique, and/ or correct identification of pathology. Additionally, the participant who has accumulated the most badges will be awarded a prize.

A post-test will be administered after completion of the training period to compare learning between the two groups, consisting of:

#### 1. Knowledge Test

Knowledge acquisition will be evaluated using a 30 minute (17 questions) multiplechoice question test designed to assess theoretical knowledge of colonoscopy.

#### 2. Simulation-based Assessment

Consent Form, Version Date: September 5, 2017 Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy; impact on clinical performance For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml You will be assessed through the completion of a colonoscopy procedure on the VR simulator. As with the pre-test, the post-test will include an "integrated scenario" which links a standardized patient with the VR colonoscopy simulator. You will once again be required to explain the procedure, its benefits and risks, and obtain informed consent. You will then carry out the procedure on the simulator while responding to the patient as appropriate. Once again, the performance of all participants will be videotaped, such that their faces are not captured to ensure anonymity, in order to obtain performance measures.

#### 3. Patient-based transfer test

You will then be contacted to undertake two colonoscopies on real patients. These procedures will be videotaped in a manner that anonymizes you and the patient. The videotapes will be assessed by two independent blinded expert endoscopists.

#### Potential Harms (Injury/Discomfort/Inconvenience)

There are no known harms associated with participation in this study.

#### **Potential Benefits**

You will not receive credit in performing colonoscopies by participating in this study. You may receive no direct benefits from being in this study. Results from this study will be used to adjust the structure and format of the current University of Toronto virtualreality colonoscopy training curriculum for novice endoscopic trainees.

#### **Confidentiality and Privacy**

All the persons associated with this study, including the study investigators and delegates (study team) are committed to respecting your privacy. No information that discloses your identity will be published or released to any other persons without your consent unless required by law.

Video-recordings of your face are considered to be identifying personal information and will not be shown when videotaping these procedures. During the video-recordings, you are requested not to state your name or the names of anyone else or any institutions. However if this does happen, you should know that the audio track from the video will be removed so identifying information is removed.

Any records, documentation, or information related to you will be coded by study numbers to ensure that persons outside of the study will not be able to identify you. All study data forms will be identified by study code number and not by name. No identifying information about you will be allowed off site. All information that identifies you and study data will be securely stored at St. Michael's Hospital. The video recordings will be securely destroyed after data collection. Other identifying information will be securely destroyed after all the colonoscopy procedures have been completed. The study

data will be securely destroyed when the study results have been published, within five years after completion of the study.

It is important to understand that despite these protections being in place, experience in similar studies indicates that there is the risk of unintentional release of information. The principal investigator and study personnel will protect your records and keep all the information in your study file confidential to the greatest extent possible. The chance that this information will accidentally be given to someone else is minimal.

Data collected during this study will not form any part of your evaluation for the rotation and will not be forwarded to your program director or any other individual involved in your evaluation in residency. The study investigators will have access to the coded study data, but will not have access to your identifying information, including the videorecordings. The St. Michael's Hospital Research Ethics Board may have access to your identifying information and study data collected, for the purpose of study monitoring.

In no way does signing this consent form waive your legal rights nor release the investigators or involved institution from their legal and professional responsibilities.

#### Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal

Participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to decline participation in this study and to withdraw from the study at any time if you so desire. Whether you participate in this study or not, it will not have any effect on your clinical evaluations, or standing in your academic program at the University of Toronto, nor will it in any way affect your admission to (or current status in) a residency/fellowship program, nor your current or future employment at St. Michael's Hospital. If you withdraw or are withdrawn from the study, information gathered from you up to that point will be kept and used in the study, unless you request that it not be used, and we are able to remove it.

#### Study Results

We may present this study at a scientific conference and we intend to write an article about this study for a scientific journal. No identifying information about you will be revealed in any presentation or publication about the study. Study results will be communicated to you by request following completion of the study. You can ask for a copy of the published article by contacting Michael Scaffidi, Research Assistant, at (416) 864-5628 or by e-mail at scaffidim@smh.ca.

#### Potential Costs of Participant and Reimbursement to the Participant

Participating in this study will not result in any costs charged to you, and as such, no reimbursements or compensation will be provided.

#### <u>Sponsor</u>

This study is funded by a grant from the University of Toronto.

#### **Compensation for Injury**

If you suffer a physical injury from (the procedure(s) or participation) in this study, medical care will be provided to you in the same manner as you would ordinarily obtain any other medical treatment. In no way does signing this form waive your legal rights nor release the study doctor(s), sponsors or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities.

#### Participation and Withdrawal

Participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to decline participation in this study and to withdraw from the study at any time if you so desire. Whether you participate in this study or not, it will not have any effect on your participation in the Annual Endoscopic Simulation Course, clinical evaluations, or standing in your academic program at the University of Toronto, nor will it in any way affect your admission to (or current status in) a residency/fellowship program, nor your current or future employment at St. Michael's Hospital. If you withdraw from the study, information gathered from you up to that point will be kept and used in the study, unless you request that it not be used, and we are able to remove it.

#### Can Participation in this Study End Early?

You can choose to end your participation in this study at any time. If you withdraw voluntarily from the study, you are encouraged to contact the Research Coordinator, Michael Scaffidi, Division of Gastroenterology (416-864-5628) immediately.

If you decide to leave the study, the information about you that was collected before you left the study will still be used. No new information will be collected without your permission.

The study investigators have the right to stop your participation in the study if it is not in your best interest to continue or if you do not follow study directions

#### **Research Ethics Board Contact**

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of the Research Ethics Board, St. Michael's Hospital at 416-864-6060 ext. 2557 during regular business hours.

The study protocol and consent form have been reviewed by a committee called the Research Ethics Board at St. Michael's Hospital. The Research Ethics Board is a group of scientists, medical staff, individuals from other backgrounds (including law and ethics) and members of the community. The committee is established by the hospital to review studies for their scientific and ethical merit. The Board pays special attention to the potential harms and benefits involved in participation to the research participant as well as the benefit to society. The committee is also required to do periodic reviews of ongoing research studies. As part of this review, someone may contact you form the Research Ethics Board to discuss your experience in the research study.

#### Study Contacts

If you require further information, or have any questions concerning this study, please contact the principal investigator:

Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC Division of Gastroenterology St. Michael's Hospital 16-036 Cardinal Carter Wing 30 Bond Street Toronto, Ontario M5B 1W8 Phone: (416) 864-5628 Fax: (416) 864-5882 E-mail: grovers@smh.ca

Collect calls will be accepted.

You may also contact the research assistant, Michael Scaffidi, at (416)-864-5628 or by email at <u>scaffidim@smh.ca</u>.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your own records.

## Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy: impact on clinical performance

#### **Principal Investigator**

Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC Division of Gastroenterology St. Michael's Hospital 16-036 Cardinal Carter Wing 30 Bond Street Toronto, Ontario M5B 1W8 Phone: (416) 864-5628 Fax: (416) 864-5882 E-mail: grovers@smh.ca

#### **Declaration of Consent**

The research study has been explained to me, and any questions that I have asked about the study have been answered to my satisfaction. A member of the study team, who has no influence on my academic program, will be obtaining my consent form. I have the right not to participate and the right to withdraw from this study without affecting my participation in the Annual Endoscopic Simulation Course, evaluation or standing on my academic program at the University of Toronto, or any admission to (or current status in) a residency/fellowship program. I have also been informed that my choice will not affect my current or future employment at St. Michael's Hospital. As well, the potential harms and benefits (if any) of participating in this research study have been explained to me. I have been told that I have not waived my legal rights nor released the investigators or involved institution from their legal and professional responsibilities. I know that I may ask now, or in the future, any questions I have about the study. I have been told that records relating to me in this study will be kept confidential and that no information will be released or printed that would disclose my personal identity without my permission unless required by law. I have been given sufficient time to read the above information. I consent to participate in this study. I will be given a signed copy of this consent form.

Name of Participant (print)

Signature

Date

I have explained the study to the above-named participant and discussed the potential risks and benefits (if any) associated with participation in this research study. I have answered all questions asked with respect to this research study.

Name and Position of Person Conducting Consent Discussion (print) Signature of Person Consent Discussion Date

BMJ Open

### St. Michael's

Inspired Care. Inspiring Science.

#### Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy: impact on clinical performance

#### <u>CONSENT FORM TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY</u> Patient participants

This is a consent form regarding the above mentioned research study. A research study is a way of gathering information on a treatment, procedure or medical device or to answer a question about something that is not well understood. Before you give your consent to be a volunteer, it is important that you read the following information and ask as many questions as necessary to be sure you understand what you will be asked to do.

#### **Investigators**

Principal Investigator:

Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC Division of Gastroenterology St. Michael's Hospital 16-036 Cardinal Carter Wing 30 Bond Street Toronto, Ontario M5B 1W8 Phone: (416) 864-5628 Fax: (416) 864-5882 E-mail: grovers@smh.ca

#### **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

We have no known actual, apparent, potential or perceived conflicts of interest in conducting this study.

#### FUNDING SOURCE

This study is funded by a grant provided by the University of Toronto, Division of Gastroenterology.

#### **PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH**

You are being asked to consider participating in this study because you are booked to have a colonoscopy.

Colonoscopy is a technically challenging procedure and it requires considerable training to learn the skill. Increasingly trainees that learn these skills are learning them on high-fidelity virtual reality simulators that have been designed to teach colonoscopy, prior to performance on real patients. Although simulation-based practice is being integrated into endoscopy training curricula, there is no consensus on the best way to how to do this. One method that has been used in surgical simulation is to interlace a lecture-based curriculum with supervised procedures with feedback with experts. It is unknown whether this provides better learning than self-directed endoscopic procedural learning.

The purpose of this study is to compare performance on colonoscopies performed on a virtual reality endoscopic simulator between two groups of beginning endoscopists, one trained with a curriculum that using gamficiation and one trained with a curriculum that uses conventional simulationtraining.

#### **DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH**

#### WHAT WILL HAPPEN DURING THIS STUDY?

Two physician assessors will be asked to evaluate the performance of the physician performing your colonoscopy. In order to assess the performance, videotaping is required. The physicians will use standardized tests for performance of colonoscopy in order to perform the assessment. To ensure anonymity, your face and the endoscopist's face will not be recorded. Two views of the procedure will be captured at the same time: 1) a close-up view of the endoscopist's gloved hands using the control knobs and tube of the colonoscope and 2) the view obtained by the colonoscope's camera which shows the inside of the your bowel.

You will be asked, in person, to provide some personal health information including your age, gender, the reason why you having the colonoscopy procedure and if you have any history of a difficult colonoscopy or if you have had surgery in the past to remove part of your bowel.

#### HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?

It is anticipated that about 120 people (80 patients and 40 endoscopists) will participate in this study at St. Michael's Hospital. The study is expected to take three years to complete.

#### WHAT ARE THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF STUDY PARTICIPANTS?

All data will be collected during your scheduled colonoscopy procedure time. Participation in this study will take no additional time and the duration of your colonoscopy procedure itself will not be affected.

If you decide to participate in this study you will be asked to do the following:

(1) Provide one of the study investigators, in person, with some personal health information including your age, gender, the reason why you are having the colonoscopy procedure and if you have any history of a difficult colonoscopy or have had surgery in the past to remove part of their bowel.

(2) Agree to allow your colonoscopy procedure to be videotaped during this study. Your name and face will not be shown to the camera.

#### **POTENTIAL HARMS (Injury, discomfort, inconvenience)**

You may experience side effects from participating in this study. Some of these risks we know about. There is also the possibility of risk that we do not know about or have not seen in study subjects to date. Some of these can be managed. If you decide to take part in this study, you should contact Dr. Samir C. Grover (Division of Gastroenterology, St. Michael's Hospital, 416-864-5628) if you think you have side effects even if you think it has nothing to do with the study.

The risks we know of are:

There are no direct short- or long-term risks anticipated. Data collected will be kept completely confidential and anonymous. Even though the risk that a participant's data could become public is very small, it can never be completely eliminated. However, every precaution is taken to prevent this. Any data collected during the study (e.g. performance assessments, videotaped performance) will be identified using only an individualized number known only to the principal investigator (Drs. Grover) so that your privacy is protected.

#### POTENTIAL BENEFITS

There is no benefit to you from your participation in this study.

#### **PROTECTING YOUR INFORMATION**

You have the right to have any information about you that is collected, used or disclosed for this research study to be handled in a confidential manner. No information that discloses your identity may be released or published without your consent. All information obtained during the study will be held in strict confidence. Even though the risk that your data could become public is very small, it can never be completely eliminated. However, every precaution is taken to prevent this. Prior to starting the study, you will be assigned a unique code known only to the principal investigator (Dr. Grover) so that your privacy is protected. Any data collected during the study will be identified using only this code.

The file which links your unique study identifier with your name is the only source of information that could possibly be utilized, either alone or with other information, to identify you. This encrypted file will be kept behind locked doors in Dr. Samir Grover's office, St. Michael's Hospital until data analysis is complete (anticipated time frame: 5 years). After that time it will be securely destroyed as per hospital requirements. Only Dr. Grover (principal investigator) will have access to this file.

Any study data about you that is sent outside of the hospital will be aggregate data for research presentations and publications. No individual level data will be reported .

The investigator(s), study staff and the other people listed above will keep the information they see or receive about you confidential, including personal health information, to the extent permitted by applicable laws. Even though the risk of identifying you from the study data is very small, it can never be completely eliminated. Experience in similar studies indicates that the

greatest risk in this study to you is the unintentional release of information from your health records. The study doctor will protect your records and keep confidential all the information in your study file, including your name, address and telephone number. The chance that this information will accidentally be given to someone else is small.

You have the right to have any information about you and your health that is collected, used or disclosed for this research study to be handled in a confidential manner.

If you agree to join this study, the study doctor and his/her study team will look at your personal health information and collect only the information they need for the study. Personal health information is any information that could be used to identify you and includes your name, address, date of birth, new or existing medical records, that includes types, dates and results of medical tests or procedures.

Access to your personal health information will take place under the supervision of the Principal Investigator. The information that is collected for the study will be kept in a locked and secure area by the study doctor for 5 years. Only the study team or the people or groups listed below will be allowed to look at your records. Your participation in this study also may be recorded in your medical record at this hospital.

The following people may come to the hospital to look at the study records and at your personal health information to check that the information collected for the study is correct and to make sure the study followed proper laws and guidelines:

• Representatives of the St. Michael's Hospital Ethics Board, a group of people who oversee the ethical conduct of research studies at St. Michael's Hospital

The investigators plan to publish the results of this study. You will not be named in any reports, publications, or presentations that my come from this study. Only group data will be presented.

#### STUDY RESULTS

As mentioned, the investigators plan to publish the results of this study. Once the study has been completed, you can contact Dr. Samir C. Grover (416-864-5628) to obtain a copy of the results.

#### POTENTIAL COSTS OF PARTICIPATION AND REIMBURSEMENT TO THE PARTICIPANT

You will not have to pay for any of the procedures involved in this study. There is no reimbursement associated with participation in this study.

#### **COMPENSATION FOR INJURY**

If you suffer a physical injury from participation in this study, medical care will be provided to you in the same manner as you would ordinarily obtain any other medical treatment. In no way does signing this form waive your legal rights nor release the study investigators, sponsors, or other involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities.

#### PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

 Participation in any research study is voluntary. If you choose to participate in this study, you can change your mind without reason and withdraw from the study any time up to 5 years. After 5 years, your data will be anonymized and it will no longer be possible to identify which data are yours. In addition, it you decide to decline participation or withdraw from the study at any time, this will have no impact on the care you or your family will receive at St. Michael's Hospital.

#### **CAN PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY END EARLY?**

You can choose to end your participation in this study at any time. If you withdraw voluntarily from the study, you are encouraged to contact Dr. Samir C. Grover, Division of Gastroenterology (416-864-5628) immediately.

If you decide to leave the study, the information about you that was collected before you left the study will still be used. No new information will be collected without your permission.

The study investigators have the right to stop your participation in the study if it is not in your best interest to continue or if you do not follow study directions.

#### **RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD CONTACT**

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact Chair of the Research Ethics Board at 416-864-6060 ext. 2557 during business hours.

The study protocol and consent form have been reviewed by a committee called the Research Ethics Board at St. Michael's Hospital. The Research Ethics Board is a group of scientists, medical staff, individuals from other backgrounds (including law and ethics) and members of the community. The committee is established by the hospital to review studies for their scientific and ethical merit. The Board pays special attention to the potential harms and benefits involved in participation to the research participant as well as the benefit to society. The committee is also required to do periodic reviews of ongoing research studies. As part of this review, someone may contact you form the Research Ethics Board to discuss your experience in the research study.

#### **STUDY CONTACTS**

If you have any questions, concerns or would like to speak to the study team for any reason, please call Dr. Samir C. Grover at 416-864-5628.

#### **INFORMED CONSENT**

Study Title: Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy: impact on clinical performance

Principal investigator:

Dr. Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Medicine St. Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto 416-864-5628 (available Mon to Fri 9:00 AM – 5:00 PM)

The research study has been explained to me and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have been informed of the alternatives to participation in this study. I have the right not to participate and the right to withdraw without affecting the quality of medical care at St. Michael's Hospital for me and for other members of my family. As well, the potential harms and benefits (if any) of participating in this research study have been explained to me. I have been told that I have not waived my legal rights nor released the investigators, sponsors, or involved institutions of their legal and professional responsibilities. I know that I may ask now, or in the future, any questions I have about the study. I have been told that study records relating to me will be kept confidential and that no information will be disclosed without my permission unless required by law. I have been given sufficient time to read the above information.

I consent to participate. I have been told that I will be given a signed copy of this consent form.

Signature

Date

I **agree** to allow my colonoscopy procedure to be videotaped during this study as described in this consent form.

I **do not agree** to allow my colonoscopy procedure to be videotaped during this study as described in this consent form.

Person obtaining consent

By signing this form, I confirm that:

• This study and its purpose has been explained to the participant named above

- All questions asked by the participant have been answered
- I will give a copy of this signed and dated document to the participant

Name of person obtaining	Signature	Date
consent (print)		
ASSISTANCE DECLARATION	□ (check here if not applicable)	

The participant/substitute decision-maker was assisted during the consent process as follows
(please check the relevant box and complete the signature space below):

The person signing below acted as a translator for the participant during the consent process and attests that the study as set out in this form was accurately translated and has had any questions answered.

I have been requested to interpret the consent discussion for the potential research participant (\_\_\_\_\_\_\_). I am competent in the English language and in the language of choice of the potential participant (\_\_\_\_\_\_\_). I am not involved in the research study. I agree to keep confidential all personal information of the potential participant. I have interpreted the consent discussion. The potential participant has advised me in his/her own language that he/she has been informed about the research study, the nature and extent of his/her participation, including the risks involved. The potential participant freely gives his/her consent to participate in this study.

Finited Name of Interpreter	Printed	Name	of	Inter	preter
-----------------------------	---------	------	----	-------	--------

Signature

of Interpreter Date

Relationship or Position of Interpreter

Contact Information of Interpreter

The consent form was read to the participant/substitute decision-maker, and the person signing below attests that the study was accurately explained to, and apparently understood by, the participant/substitute decision-maker.

Name of Witness

Signature

\_\_\_\_ Print Date

Relationship to Participant



SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents\*

formati 1 2a 2b 3 4	ion Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set Date and version identifier
1 2a 2b 3 4	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if applicable, trial acronym Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set Date and version identifier
2a 2b 3 4	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set Date and version identifier
2b 3 4	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set Date and version identifier
3 4	Date and version identifier
4	
	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support
5a	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors
5b	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor
5c	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities
5d	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)
6a	Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention
6b	Explanation for choice of comparators
7	Specific objectives or hypotheses
8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework (eg superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, exploratory)
	5b 5c 5d 6a 6b 7 8

1 2	Methods: Partici	pants,	interventions, and outcomes
3 4 5 6	Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained
7 8 9 10	Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)
12 13 14	Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered
15 16 17 18		11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease)
19 20 21 22		11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return, laboratory tests)
23 24 25		11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial
26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33	Outcomes	12	Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific measurement variable (eg, systolic blood pressure), analysis metric (eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of aggregation (eg, median, proportion), and time point for each outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen efficacy and harm outcomes is strongly recommended
34 35 36 37	Participant timeline	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for participants. A schematic diagram is highly recommended (see Figure)
38 39 40 41	Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study objectives and how it was determined, including clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any sample size calculations
42 43 44	Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach target sample size
45 46	Methods: Assigr	ment	of interventions (for controlled trials)
47 48	Allocation:		· · ·
49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58	Sequence generation	16a	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg, computer- generated random numbers), and list of any factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg, blocking) should be provided in a separate document that is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign interventions
59 60	For pe	er revie	w only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 2

Allocation concealment mechanism	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg, central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the sequence until interventions are assigned
Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol participants, and who will assign participants to interventions
Blinding (masking)	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and how
	17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's allocated intervention during the trial
Methods: Data co	llectio	n, management, and analysis
Data collection methods	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other trial data, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a description of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if not in the protocol
	18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from intervention protocols
Data management	19	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, double data entry; range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data management procedures can be found, if not in the protocol
Statistical methods	20a	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes. Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the protocol
	20b	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted analyses)
	20c	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple imputation)
Methods: Monitor	ring	
Data monitoring	21a	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of whether it is independent from the sponsor and competing interests; and reference to where further details about its charter can be found, if not in the protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is not needed
For pee	r reviev	v only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 3

1 2 3 4		21b	Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim results and make the final decision to terminate the trial
5 6 7 8	Harms	22	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial conduct
9 10 11 12 13	Auditing	23	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent from investigators and the sponsor
14	Ethics and dissen	ninatio	n
16 17 18	Research ethics /	24	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval
19 20 21 22 23	Protocol amendments	25	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)
24 25 26	Consent or assent	26a	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)
27 28 29		26b	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable
30 31 32 33	Confidentiality	27	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial
34 35 36	Declaration of interests	28	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site
37 38 39 40	Access to data	29	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators
41 42 43	Ancillary and post-trial care	30	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation
45 46 47 48 49	Dissemination policy	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions
50 51 52		31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers
53 54 55 56 57 58		31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant- level dataset, and statistical code
59 60	For pee	r review	only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 4

#### **Appendices**

Informed consent materials	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates
Biological specimens	33	Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in the current trial and for future use in application, if applicable

\*It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the SPIRIT 2013 Explanation & Elaboration for important clarification on the items. Amendments to the protocol should be tracked and dated. The SPIRIT checklist is copyrighted by the SPIRIT Group under the Creative Commons "Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported" license.

voi use in ano. at this checklist it important clarificatito and dated. The SPIRIT c. . Commons "<u>Attribution-NonC</u>.

**BMJ** Open

## **BMJ Open**

# Protocol for a randomized trial evaluating the effect of applying gamification to simulation-based endoscopy training

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-024134.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-Nov-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Scaffidi, Michael; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Khan, Rishad; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Walsh, Catharine; Hospital for Sick Children, Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition, Learning Institute, and Research Institute; University of Toronto, The Wilson Centre Pearl, Matthew; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Winger, Kathleen; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Kalaichandran, Ruben; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Lin, Peter; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Grover, Samir; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Medical education and training
Secondary Subject Heading:	Gastroenterology and hepatology
Keywords:	Endoscopy < GASTROENTEROLOGY, MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING, Simulation

#### SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
20 21	
27	
32	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
50	

Protocol for a randomized trial evaluating the effect of applying gamification to simulationbased endoscopy training

Michael A. Scaffidi<sup>1</sup>; Rishad Khan<sup>1</sup>; Catharine M. Walsh<sup>3,4</sup>; Matthew Pearl<sup>1</sup>; Kathleen Winger<sup>1</sup>; Ruben Kalaichandran<sup>1</sup>; Peter Lin<sup>1</sup>, Samir C. Grover<sup>1</sup>

Division of Gastroenterology, St. Michael's Hospital<sup>1</sup> Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition, Learning Institute, and Research Institute, Hospital for Sick Children<sup>3</sup> The Wilson Centre, University of Toronto<sup>4</sup>

#### **Author Contributions**

Study conception and design: Scaffidi, Pearl, Walsh, Kalaichandran, Lin, Grover Data acquisition: Scaffidi, Khan, Walsh, Winger, Kalaichandran, Lin, Grover Analysis and interpretation of data: Scaffidi, Khan, Walsh, Grover Drafting of the manuscript: Scaffidi, Khan, Walsh, Grover, Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Scaffidi, Khan, Walsh, Pearl, Winger, Kalaichandran, Lin, Grover Final manuscript approval: Scaffidi, Khan, Walsh, Pearl, Winger, Kalaichandran, Lin, Grover

Trial Registration: Clinicaltrial.gov NCT03176251.

**Funding Agencies**: This work was supported by the Canadian Association of Gastroenterology and the AbbVie Centre of Excellence in Continuing Health Education [grant number: 2017CAG-ABBVIE-ERG].

Declarations: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Corresponding Author: Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC Division of Gastroenterology St. Michael's Hospital 16-036 Cardinal Carter Wing 30 Bond Street Toronto, Ontario M5B 1W8 Phone: (416) 864-5628 E-mail: grovers@smh.ca

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

#### Abstract

**Background:** Simulation-based training provides a safe environment and effective means to enhance skills development. Simulation-based curricula have been developed for a number of procedures, including gastrointestinal endoscopy. Gamification, which is the application of game-design principles to non-game contexts, is an instructional strategy with potential to enhance learning. No studies that have investigated the effects of a comprehensive gamification curriculum on the acquisition of endoscopic skills among novice endoscopists.

**Methods and analysis:** Thirty-six novice endoscopists will be randomized to one of two endoscopy simulation-based training curricula: (1) the Conventional Curriculum Group, in which participants will receive 6 hours of one-on-one simulation training augmented with expert feedback and interlaced with 4 hours of small group teaching on the theory of colonoscopy; or (2) the Gamified Curriculum Group, in which participants will receive the same curriculum with integration of the following game-design elements: a leaderboard summarizing participant performance, game narrative, achievement badges, and rewards for top performance. In line with a progressive learning approach, simulation training for participants will progress from low to high complexity simulators, starting with a bench top model and then moving to the EndoVR® virtual reality simulator. Performance will be assessed at three points: pre-training, immediately post-training and 4-6 weeks after training. Assessments will take place on the simulator at all three time points and transfer of skills will be assessed during two clinical colonoscopies 4-6 weeks post-training. Mixed factorial ANOVAs will be used to determine if there is a performance difference between the two groups during simulated and clinical assessments.

**Ethics and dissemination:** Ethical approval was obtained at St. Michael's Hospital. Results of this trial will be submitted for presentation at academic meetings and for publication in a peer-reviewed journal.

#### Strengths and limitations of this study

- The intervention in this randomized trial is a comprehensive gamified simulationbased curriculum in gastrointestinal endoscopy that includes a game narrative, performance tracking measures, and rewards. These game-design elements are grounded in educational theory.
- The primary outcome is clinical performance of live colonoscopies on real patients, which will be assessed by two blinded independent expert endoscopists using an assessment tool with strong validity evidence.
- Participants will be assessed immediately after training for skill acquisition, and 4-6 weeks after training to evaluate skill retention and transfer of skills to the clinical environment.
- There are significant human resources required for implementation with respect to tracking participants' game metrics and adjusting leaderboards.

Key Words: simulation; colonoscopy; gamification; skill acquisition
### Introduction

Simulation-based training (SBT) provides a safe and effective means to enhance skills development in gastrointestinal endoscopy.<sup>1,2</sup> SBT is more effective when embedded within a curriculum that is grounded in educational theory.<sup>3–6</sup> While previous studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of comprehensive structured curricula and curricula based on a progressive learning approach<sup>4,7</sup>, other instructional strategies may further enhance procedural skills training.

One such enhancement may lie in gamification. Gamification refers to the application of game design elements, (conceptual building blocks central to creating successful games) to traditionally non-game contexts.<sup>8–10</sup> The overall purpose of gamification is to "encourage behavioral change and promote desired attitudes."<sup>11</sup> Gamification has previously been applied in health-related settings such as health promotion and e-health.<sup>12–14</sup> More recently, it has been gaining traction in the medical education setting, as gamification has the potential to improve learning and learner attention, engagement, motivation and behaviour change.<sup>8,15</sup> In a recent randomized trial, participants were ranked on a leaderboard as they completed cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) training.<sup>16</sup> After training, participants who were ranked on a leaderboard had significantly better technical skills acquisition on the CPR training device. Another recent trial evaluated the effect of competition on novices' ability to learn simulated laparoscopic cholecystectomy.<sup>17</sup> The authors found that participants who engaged in competition demonstrated fewer movements and a shorter path length, suggesting increased efficiency.

While these reports highlight the potential benefits of gamification in educational contexts, the use of leaderboards and competition represent narrow applications of gamification. To date, there are no studies that have investigated the application of a comprehensive gamified curriculum that integrates multiple game design elements for procedural learning in medicine. Additionally, no studies have reported clinical outcomes on real patients. To bridge these gaps, we aim to determine the impact of a gamified simulation-based curriculum in endoscopy on clinical performance, compared to an identical curriculum that does not incorporate game design elements.

### Methods & Analysis

### Study Design

This single-blinded, parallel group, randomized controlled trial (RCT) is currently being conducted at St. Michael's Hospital in Toronto, Canada. Recruitment started June 2017. The methodology was adapted from previous studies by our group.<sup>3,4,18</sup> We used the SPIRIT checklist when writing our report.<sup>19</sup> The study design is summarized below in **Figure 1**.

### Participants

Thirty-six novice endoscopists (performed < 25 previous real and/or simulated colonoscopies) will be recruited by one author (MAS). Participants will be included if they are from the general surgery or gastroenterology residency programs at the University of Toronto. Participants will be excluded if they have performed greater than 25 previous real and/or simulated colonoscopies.

### Simulators

### Bench Top Simulator

The bench top colonoscopy simulator is comprised of a series of vertical wooden barriers with numbered holes conforming to 27 different sequences of varying complexity. Participants use a real videocolonoscope, which provides visual output, to navigate through each sequence. This bench top endoscopy simulator helps develop general endoscopic skills and has shown good validity evidence for training novices.<sup>20</sup>

### Virtual Reality Simulator

The EndoVR® virtual reality (VR) endoscopy simulator (CAE Healthcare, Montreal) is used for the VR training and all simulator tests. It models navigation through a colon, using a specialized endoscope that is inserted into a computer-based module with a screen showing

the colonic lumen of a virtual patient. It provides visual and haptic feedback related to the procedure. The simulator has several standardized case-based scenarios of varying complexity for colonoscopy and has robust validity evidence in the context of novices.<sup>21,22</sup>

### **Experimental Design**

#### (1) Baseline questionnaires

Participants will complete a questionnaire to collect baseline demographic information, including age, sex, level of training, and previous endoscopic experience. Questions regarding experience with team sports and video games will also be included, as these may correlate with baseline endoscopic skil<sup>23</sup> (**Appendix 1**). Additionally, scales assessing the following variables will be administered: (1) competitiveness (Revised Competitiveness Index, **Appendix 2**); (2) self-efficacy (adapted General Self-Efficacy Scale, **Appendix 3**); and (3) game-type personality (Gamified User Personality Hexad, **Appendix 4**). All the included scales have good validity evidence.<sup>24–26</sup>

### (2) Pre-test

Participants will complete a series of assessments prior to training to assess (1) their baseline knowledge of colonoscopy (knowledge test); (2) technical skills (VR simulation test); and (3) non-technical skills (VR simulation "integrated scenario" test). No feedback will be provided at any point during these assessments.

- 1. *Knowledge Test:* A 30-minute, 17 item multiple choice question (MCQ) test designed to assess core concepts related to colonoscopy, including indications, pathology, and theory underpinning non-technical skills (**Appendix 5**).
- 2. VR Simulation Test: A colonoscopy procedure on the VR simulator with a time limit of 30 minutes. Baseline technical proficiency will be assessed by an expert endoscopist. The procedure will be video-recorded, with identifying features hidden, to allow for a blinded assessment at a later time.<sup>27</sup>
- 3. *VR Simulation "Integrated Scenario" Test:* A test in which participants will complete a colonoscopy procedure on the VR simulator in a naturalistic setting (i.e., endoscopy suite) while interacting with a standardized nurse and standardized patient.<sup>28</sup> Trainees will be expected to take a brief patient history and obtain informed consent. The trainee will then carry out the procedure (EndoVR® Module 3 Polypectomy) as described above while responding to the patient and interacting with the nurse as appropriate. As in the technical test, performance will be assessed in real time and videotaped, ensuring anonymity is preserved.

### (3) Training intervention

Following the pre-tests, participants will be randomized to one of two training groups, following a 1:1 allocation distribution

with no stratification. One author (RK) used an online sequence generator (<u>https://www.random.org/sequences/</u>) to generate a random sequence of numbers and placed labels with these numbers into sealed envelopes. Another author (MP), not involved in sequence generation, distributed the sealed envelopes to participants as they arrived for the course. The first author (RK) was not present during envelope distribution. Investigators were blinded to group allocation.

1. Conventional Curriculum (controls): The control group will receive a total of four, one-hour, small-group teaching sessions covering the theory of colonoscopy, including pathology, anatomy, and therapeutic technique. One session is dedicated to non-technical skills relevant to endoscopy (situation awareness, decision making, communication, teamwork, and leadership) and how they relate to clinical performance. In this session, participants will watch a video demonstrating ideal endoscopic non-technical skills and learn about the Endoscopic Non-Technical Skills (E-NTS) checklist which will be provided for them to use during the integrated scenario training (Appendix 6). This checklist was developed in accordance with evidence-based recommendations, and outlines key endoscopic non-technical skills.<sup>29</sup> Following each teaching session, a short MCQ test on the topics covered in that session will be administered, in keeping with the "test-enhanced learning" literature.<sup>30</sup> In addition to teaching sessions, the control group will be given a total of six hours of expertassisted instruction on both the bench top simulator (1 hour) and the VR simulator (5 hours).

Six modules of increasing difficulty in colonoscopy will be taught with one-on-one feedback from an expert academic endoscopist. The instructor will demonstrate techniques, answer questions and provide individualized performance feedback with a focus on non-technical skills. The last two hours of training on the VR simulator will consist of integrated scenarios, which feature a standardized patient and nurse. Following each scenario, the instructor will debrief the trainee on their performance, using the "E-NTS Checklist" as a framework for discussing their non-technical skills.

2. Gamified Curriculum (GC): This group will receive the same 4 hours of small group teaching and 6-hours of hands-on simulator training. Within the context of the teaching sessions and simulator training, the gamified curriculum will incorporate the following game design elements: a game narrative; performance tracking measures; and rewards. First, a game narrative will underlie the delivery of the gamified curriculum. Participants will be assigned an avatar and will be tasked with completing a journey of the avatar around a game-board shaped like the colon (Appendix 7) with the goal of reaching the final destination, the terminal ileum. Second, performance tracking measures will be used to allow participants to gauge their performance over time. These measures will be summarized on a leaderboard, which will include 4 components: a non-technical skills score; a technical skills score; a cognitive skills score; and an overall ranking, which will be determined through an algorithm that accounts for non-technical, technical and cognitive scores. Scoring of the non-technical and technical skills will be based on assessed performances during practice sessions on the VR simulator using the Modified Objective Structured Assessment of Non-Technical Skills (MOSANTS) (Appendix 8) and the Joint Advisory Group for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy's Direct Observation of Procedural Skills (JAG DOPS) tool (Appendix 9), respectively. Scoring of cognitive skills will be based on MCQ test scores from the teaching sessions. Scores will be aggregated on the leaderboard for participants training on the same days. The leaderboard will be presented to participants after they finish each hour of practice. Finally, participants will engage in a system of both short-term and long-term rewards. One short-term reward will involve badges to recognize achievements of procedural benchmarks (e.g. cecal intubation) (Appendix 10). Another short-term reward will be the assignment of a wearable medallion, which will be given to the participant with the highest overall ranking at the end of each hour of practice. The long-term reward will be a low-cost prize (i.e. less than \$25 CAD) given to the participant with the highest overall ranking throughout practice. All three game design elements (game narrative, performance tracking measures, reward system) will be introduced to participants in the gamified curriculum group prior to training with a brief tutorial video. After watching the video, participants will receive an anonymized ID to allow for self-tracking on the leaderboard while keeping individual scores private.

All three game design elements are consistent with recommendations from the gamification and educational literature. In line with self-determination theory, leaderboards are purported to increase users' sense of relatedness, engagement and competence through social comparison, feedback provision and documentation of achievement.<sup>31</sup> The rationale for achievement badges and other rewards is that they serve as visual symbol of attained goals, thus supporting participants' sense of competence and serving to foster external motivation and engagement<sup>31,32</sup>. Finally, game narratives are thought to enhance engagement through the integration of meaning and interaction.<sup>9</sup> These elements must be carefully calibrated to challenge and engage learners appropriately and to ensure maintenance of learners' intrinsic motivation.<sup>8,15</sup>

#### (4) Post-test

1 2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 50

51

52

53

54

55 56

57

58

59

60

Participants will complete a series of assessments immediately after training (immediate posttest). These will assess: (1) knowledge acquisition; (2) technical skills acquisition; and (3) non-technical skills acquisition. They will include the same *Knowledge Test*, *VR Simulation Test*, and *VR Simulation "Integrated Scenario" Test* that participants will complete during the *Pre-test*.

#### (5) Delayed testing (Retention and Transfer)

Participants will complete a series of assessments 4 to 6 weeks after training to assess their retention and transfer of skills. These will assess the following: (1) knowledge retention; (2) technical skills retention; (3) non-technical skills retention; and (4) transfer of skills to the

clinical environment. They will include the same *Knowledge Test*, *VR Simulation Test*, and *VR Simulation "Integrated Scenario" Test* that participants will complete during the *Pre-test* and the *Post-test*. To assess for transfer of skills to the clinical environment, participants will also complete two live colonoscopies on real patients. These two procedures occurred simultaneously on a single day between 4 and 6 weeks after completion of training .These procedures will be videotaped in a manner that anonymizes the identity of the participant and the patient. Procedures on patients with a history of colonic or pelvic surgery or difficult colonoscopy will be excluded. Sedation and monitoring will be carried out according to standard practices on the endoscopy unit. An experienced attending endoscopist (completed > 500 previous colonoscopies) will provide verbal and/or hands-on assistance as necessary and take over if the participant cannot complete the procedure, or if any concerns regarding patient safety ariose. All patients were consented for the use of their procedure in this study.

#### **Patient and Public Involvement**

We based our approach to patient involvement on previously published studies focusing on clinical outcomes for endoscopic training<sup>3,4</sup>, Specifically, patient involvement will be limited to their participation in the primary outcome, which involves assessment of clinical colonoscopies by study participants. Patients will not be required to evaluate the impact of the intervention. There will be no public involvement.

#### Primary outcome measure

The primary outcome measure is clinical performance during two live colonoscopies 4 to 6 weeks after training, as assessed by the JAG DOPS.<sup>33</sup>. Each clinical colonoscopy will be independently assessed by two experienced endoscopists who will be blinded to group assignment. One rater will be present during the procedure and the other rater will assess the participant's performance using the video-recorded procedure. Video-based assessment of endoscopic performances has been shown to have good validity evidence, compared to live assessment.<sup>27</sup>

#### Secondary outcome measures

- 1. Knowledge acquisition, as assessed by the MCQ Knowledge Tests
- 2. Technical skills acquisition during the VR Simulation Tests, as assessed by the JAG DOPS (Appendix 9)
- 3. Non-technical skills acquisition during the Integrated Scenario Test, as assessed by the Modified Objective Structured Assessment of Non-Technical Skills (M-OSANTS) for colonoscopy, which has good validity evidence for surgery and was modified for endoscopy<sup>5</sup> (Appendix 8)
- Patient comfort during the clinical colonoscopies, as assessed by the endoscopy nurses using the Nurse-Assessed Patient Comfort Score (NAPCOMS)<sup>34</sup> (Appendix 11)

#### Exploratory outcome measures

- Participant self-efficacy after each simulated and clinical colonoscopy testing procedure, as measured by an adapted General Self-Efficacy Scale<sup>25</sup> (Appendix 3)
- Cognitive load after each simulated and clinical colonoscopy testing procedure, as measured by the Cognitive Load Scale for Colonoscopy<sup>35</sup> (Appendix 12)
- Participant competitiveness after each simulated and clinical colonoscopy testing procedure, measured using the Revised Competitiveness Index<sup>24</sup> (Appendix 2).

Experienced endoscopists will assess participants' technical skills and non-technical skills during the pre-training, immediate and delayed post-training simulation-based assessments.

#### **Data Management**

Data will be collected through paper forms directly from assessors. Data from the forms will be extracted and input into a database on a password-protected computer. There is no requirement for a data monitoring committee as this is not a trial addressing the efficacy of a treatment nor is patient safety at risk. Details with respect to protection of confidentiality of participant data is outlined in the participant and patient consent forms (**Appendix 13**,

### Appendix 14).

### **Analysis Plan**

Statistical analyses will be performed using SPSS version 20 (SPSS, Inc, Chicago, IL). Alpha for all statistical tests will be set at 0.05. For all primary and sub-group analysis, appropriate measures will be taken to minimize an inflated Type I error due to multiple comparisons.

**Baseline Questionnaire:** Participant baseline variables will be characterized with descriptive statistics, using mean with standard deviation for continuous variables and number frequency for categorical variables, respectively.

**Clinical Performance:** Performance during the live colonoscopies will be compared between the two groups using the JAG DOPS, NAPCOMS, and MOSANTS scores. A mixed factor 2 (Gamified vs. Conventional Curriculum) x 2 (procedure 1 vs. procedure 2) analysis of variance (ANOVA) will be used. ANOVA differences significant at P < 0.05 will be further analyzed using Tukey honestly significant difference (HSD) post hoc tests. In addition, sensitivity analyses of the mixed factor ANOVA will be performed with gender and residency program (i.e. gastroenterology, general surgery) as covariates, as previous literature has identified gender differences in the acquisition of surgical skills<sup>36</sup>.

**Technical Performance**: Differences in technical skills acquisition on the simulator will be determined by comparing JAG DOPS scores between groups. Specifically, a mixed factor 2 (Gamified vs. Conventional Curriculum) x 3 (pre-test, post-test, retention test) ANOVA with Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests will be conducted.

*Non-Technical Skill Performance:* Differences in non-technical skills acquisition on the simulator will be determined by comparing MOSANTS scores. A mixed factor 2 (Gamified vs. Conventional Curriculum) x 3 (pre-test, post-test, retention test) ANOVA with Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests will be conducted.

**Competitiveness:** Baseline competitiveness, as measured by the Revised Competitiveness Index and the Gamification User Types Hexad, will be compared between groups using an independent t-test for each index.

**Self-efficacy:** Differences in self-efficacy between groups will be determined by comparing General Self-Efficacy Scale scores. A mixed factor 2 (Gamified vs. Conventional Curriculum) x 2 (pre-course vs. post- course) ANOVA with Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests will be conducted.

**Cognitive Load:** Differences in cognitive load between groups will be determined by comparing Cognitive Load Index of Colonoscopy scores. A mixed factor 2 (Gamified vs. Conventional Curriculum) x 2 (pre-course vs. post- course) ANOVA with Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests will be conducted.

### Sample size estimation

Since there are no prior studies investigating a gamified curriculum for procedural learning, we conducted the power analysis based on the effect size from a previous study that evaluated an SBT curriculum for endoscopy.<sup>3</sup> Based on an effect size of 1.0 (Cohen's d), an alpha of 0.05 (two-tailed), a beta of 0.10, 2 groups, and 2 measurements, a minimum of 17 participants will be required to achieve a power of greater than 0.90 using repeated measures ANOVA (between-factors). To accommodate for a potential 5% dropout and/or non-response, we will recruit a total of 36 participants.

### **Ethics and Dissemination**

Research ethics approval was granted by the St. Michael's Hospital Research Ethics Board (17-092). Protocol version 1.0, dated March 23, 2017, was approved. If any protocol modifications are needed, they will be made after communication with the research ethics board and will be detailed in any subsequent publications. Informed consent will be obtained from endoscopist participants and patients on whom participants will perform colonoscopies by one author (MAS). No personal health data on patients will be collected. All authors will have access to trial data. We will disseminate the results of the study through peer-reviewed

publication in journals and at scientific meetings. We do not plan to make participant-level data publicly available. The trial is registered at clinicaltrials.gov NCT03176251

### Feasibility

To date, 21 participants have been recruited, randomized and have completed the study. Data collection is ongoing and is intended to reach completion by August 2018. Subsequent data analysis, manuscript writing and submission for publication are anticipated to reach completion by July 2019.

### Discussion

The use of SBT for procedural skills training is widespread. In the report commissioned by the Future of Medical Education in Canada Postgraduate Project, the authors conclude that "simulation... needs to be integrated more thoughtfully into postgraduate curricula."<sup>37</sup> We aim to respond to this call through the development of an SBT curriculum grounded in educational theory. The strengths of this study lie in its randomized design and incorporation of various game design elements into the curriculum. Additionally, the primary outcome is measured in the clinical setting by two blinded expert assessors using an assessment tool with strong validity evidence. Finally, participants will be assessed both immediately after training for skill acquisition, and 4-6 weeks after training to evaluate skill retention and skill transfer to the clinical environment. There are several limitations of this study, which include the significant human resources required to track participants' game metrics and adjust leaderboards, the identification of participants who have the wearable medallion, used to signify the participant in the study arm with the highest ranking after each hour of practice, and that participant frustration with underperforming was not included as a measure.

### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank David Rojas for his input regarding the implementation of gamification principles and Roger Chow for administrative assistance.

### REFERENCES

- 1. Walsh CM, Sherlock ME, Ling SC, Carnahan H. Virtual reality simulation training for health professions trainees in gastrointestinal endoscopy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2012;6(6):CD008237. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD008237.pub2.
- Singh S, Sedlack RE, Cook DA. Effects of Simulation-Based Training in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2014;12(10):1611-1623.e4. doi:10.1016/j.cgh.2014.01.037.
- Grover SC, Garg A, Scaffidi MA, et al. Impact of a simulation training curriculum on technical and nontechnical skills in colonoscopy: a randomized trial. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2015;82(6):1072-1079. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2015.04.008.
- 4. Grover SC, Scaffidi MA, Khan R, et al. Progressive learning in endoscopy simulation training improves clinical performance: a blinded randomized trial. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2017;86(5):881-889. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2017.03.1529.
- 5. Dedy NJ, Bonrath EM, Ahmed N, Grantcharov TP. Structured Training to Improve Nontechnical Performance of Junior Surgical Residents in the Operating Room. *Ann Surg.* 2016;263(1):43-49. doi:10.1097/SLA.000000000001186.
- 6. Young OM, Parviainen K. Training obstetrics and gynecology residents to be effective communicators in the era of the 80-hour workweek: a pilot study. *BMC Res Notes*. 2014;7:455. doi:10.1186/1756-0500-7-455.
- 7. Walsh CM, Ling SC, Khanna N, et al. Gastrointestinal endoscopy competency assessment tool: Reliability and validity evidence. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2015;81(6):1417-1424.e2. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2014.11.030.
- 8. Rutledge C, Walsh CM, Swinger N, et al. Gamification in action: Theoretical and practical considerations for medical educators. *Acad Med.* 2018:1. doi:10.1097/ACM.00000000002183.
- 9. Deterding S, Dixon D, Khaled R, Nacke L. From game design elements to gamefulness: defining gamification. In: *Proceedings of the 15th International Academic MindTrek Conference: Envisioning Future Media Environments*. ACM; 2011:9-15.
- 10. Yunyongying P. Gamification: Implications for Curricular Design. *J Grad Med Educ*. 2014;6(3):410-412. doi:10.4300/JGME-D-13-00406.1.
- 11. Almarshedi A, Wanick V, Wills GB, Ranchhod A. Gamification and Behaviour. In: Steiglitz S, Lattemann C, Robra-Bissantz S, Zarnekow R, Brockmann T, eds. *Using Game Elements in Serious Contexts*. Springer; 2017:19-30. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-45557-0.
- 12. Edwards EA, Lumsden J, Rivas C, et al. Gamification for health promotion: systematic review of behaviour change techniques in smartphone apps. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(10):e012447. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012447.
- 13. Johnson D, Deterding S, Kuhn KA, Staneva A, Stoyanov S, Hides L. Gamification for health and wellbeing: A systematic review of the literature. *Internet Interv.* 2016;6:89-106. doi:10.1016/j.invent.2016.10.002.
- 14. Sardi L, Idri A, Fernández-Alemán JL. A systematic review of gamification in e-Health. *J Biomed Inform*. 2017;71(May):31-48. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2017.05.011.
- 15. McCoy L, Lewis JH, Dalton D. Gamification and Multimedia for Medical Education: A Landscape Review. *J Am Osteopath Assoc*. 2016;116(1):22-34. doi:10.7556/jaoa.2016.003.
- 16. MacKinnon RJ, Stoeter R, Doherty C, et al. Self-motivated learning with gamification improves infant CPR performance, a randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Simul Technol Enhanc Learn*. 2015;1(3):71-76. doi:10.1136/bmjstel-2015-000061.
- 17. Hashimoto DA, Gomez ED, Beyer-Berjot L, et al. A Randomized Controlled Trial to Assess the Effects of Competition on the Development of Laparoscopic Surgical Skills. *J Surg Educ.* 2015;72(6):1077-1084. doi:10.1002/dev.21214.Developmental.
- Khan R, Scaffidi MA, Walsh CM, et al. Simulation-Based Training of Non-Technical Skills in Colonoscopy: Protocol for a Randomized Controlled Trial. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2017;6(8):e153. doi:10.2196/resprot.7690.
- 19. Chan W, Tetzlaff J, Altman D, et al. SPIRIT 2013 Statement: Defining Standard Protocol Items for Clinical Trials. *Ann Intern Med.* 2013;158(3):200-207. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-158-3-201302050-00583.
- 20. Walsh CM, Coopper MA, Rabeneck L, Carnahan H. Bench-top versus virtual reality

1		
2		
3		simulation training in Endoscopy: Expertise discrimination. CAME. 2008.
4	21.	Ekkelenkamp VE, Koch AD, de Man R a, Kuipers EJ, Man RA De, Kuipers EJ.
5 6		Training and competence assessment in GI endoscopy: a systematic review. <i>Gut.</i> 2015;0:1-9. doi:10.1136/gutinl-2014-307173
7	22	Triantafyllou K Lazaridis I D. Dimitriadis GD. Virtual reality simulators for
8		gastrointestinal endoscopy training. <i>World J Gastrointest Endosc</i> , 2014:6(1):6-12.
9		doi:10.4253/wige.v6.i1.6.
10	23.	Van Dongen KW, Verleisdonk EJMM, Schijven MP, Broeders IAMJ. Will the
11		Playstation generation become better endoscopic surgeons? Surg Endosc Other
12		Interv Tech. 2011;25(7):2275-2280. doi:10.1007/s00464-010-1548-2.
13	24.	Harris PB, Houston JM. A Reliability Analysis of the Revised Competitiveness Index.
14		Psychol Rep. 2010;106(3):870-874. doi:10.2466/pr0.106.3.870-874.
15	25.	Pena G, Altree M, Field J, et al. Surgeons' and trainees' perceived self-efficacy in
16		operating theatre non-technical skills. <i>Br J Surg</i> . 2015;102(6):708-715.
17		doi:10.1002/bjs.9787.
18	26.	Tondello GF, Wehbe RR, Diamond L, Busch M, Marczewski A, Nacke LE. The
19		Gamification User Types Hexad Scale. Proc 2016 Annu Symp Comput Interact Play - CHI Play '16. 2016:229-243. doi:10.1145/2967934.2968082.
20	27.	Scaffidi MA, Grover SC, Carnahan H, et al. A Prospective Comparison of Live and
21		Video-Based Assessments of Colonoscopy Performance. Gastrointest Endosc.
22		2017;87(3):688-694.e2. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2017.08.020.
25	28.	Kneebone R, Nestel D, Yadollahi F, et al. Assessing procedural skills in context:
24		exploring the feasibility of an Integrated Procedural Performance Instrument (IPPI).
25	00	<i>Med Educ</i> . 2006;40:1105-1114. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02612.x.
20	29.	Hales BM, Pronovost PJ. The checklist-a tool for error management and performance
27	20	Hourie W.L. Effects of test taking on totentian learning in technology education : A
20	30.	may new W. Energy of lest laking on letenilon leaning in lethology education. A meta analysis <i>Litechnol Educ</i> 2007;18(2):24,36
30	31	Huang B. Hew KF. Do points, badges and leaderboards increase learning and activity.
31	01.	A quasi-experiment on the effects of gamification 23rd Int Conf Comput Educ
32		2015:(December):275-280.
33	32.	Gnauk B, Dannecker L, Hahmann M. Leveraging gamification in demand dispatch
34		systems. Proc 2012 Jt EDBT/ICDT Work - EDBT-ICDT '12. 2012:103.
35		doi:10.1145/2320765.2320799.
36	33.	Barton JR, Corbett S, Vleuten CP Van Der, Bowel E. The validity and reliability of a
37		Direct Observation of Procedural Skills assessment tool : assessing colonoscopic
38		skills of senior endoscopists. <i>Gastrointest Endosc</i> . 2012;75(3):591-597.
39		doi:10.1016/j.gie.2011.09.053.
40	34.	Rostom A, Ross ED, Dube C, et al. Development and validation of a nurse-assessed
41		doi:10.1016/i.gio.2012.10.003
42	35	Sewell II Boscardin CK Young IO et al Measuring cognitive load during procedural
43	00.	skills training with colonoscopy as an exemplar <i>Med Educ</i> 2016;50(6):682-692
44		doi:10.1111/medu.12965.
45	36.	Ali A, Subhi Y, Ringsted C, Konge L. Gender differences in the acquisition of surgical
46		skills: a systematic review. Surg Endosc Other Interv Tech. 2015;29(11):3065-3073.
47		doi:10.1007/s00464-015-4092-2.
48	37.	LeBlanc VR, Bould MD, McNaughton N, Brydges R, Piquette D, Sharma B. Simulation
49		in Postgraduate Medical Education.; 2011.
50		
51		
52 52		
55		
54 55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		

### **FIGURES**

Figure 1: Study design.



Partie	sipant ID Number	:		
1) Se	<b>x:</b> □ Female	□ Male		
2) Ag	e:			A 1.1 1
3) Ha	ndedness:	Right		Ambidextrous
4) Ye	ar of graduation f	rom Medical	School:	
5) Pro	ogramme:	tavalanı		
		lerology		
		y specify:		
6)   6	vel of training:			
0) 20				
	$\square PGY 2$			
	DPGY 4			
	DPGY 5			
	Other (please s	specify:		
7) Do	you have previou	us experience	• in playing	video games? 🛛 Yes
	□ No			
lf y	yes, please specif	fy:		
	(a) How many h	nours do you p	ay on avera	ge per week?
	(b) What types of	of games do y	ou play?	Sports
	Role-playing		· · ·	
				Real-time strategy DC
0) Da	way have provid		(please	e describe)
o) Du endo	scopy in the clini	us experience	an periorini ted	ing gastronnestinal
enuo	softing? - Vas		leu	
lf ves	setting: Difes			
ii yoo	(c) Number of r	previous upper	r endoscopie:	s in the <i>clinical</i> setting
	(attempted or	completed):	endeeeepie	
	(d) Number of p	revious upper	endoscopies	s in the <b>simulated</b> settir
	(attempted or	completed):		
	(e) Number of p	previous colon	oscopies in t	he <i>clinical</i> setting (atte
	or completed)		· .	
	(f) Number of p	revious colono	oscopies in th	ne <i>simulated</i> setting
	(attempted or	completed): _		
	(g) Number of p	revious sigmo	idoscopies in	n the <i>clinical</i> setting
	(attempted or	completed): _		
	(h) Number of p	revious sigmo	idoscopies in	n the simulated setting
	(attempted or	completed): _		
	(i) Number of c	other <i>clinical</i> (	GI endoscopy	y procedures (please sp

<u>.</u>	
	(j) Number of other <i>simulated</i> GI endoscopy procedures (please specify procedure):
}	
0	
2	
3 4	
5	
6 7	
8	
9 0	
1	
3	
4 5	
6	
7 8	
)	
) 	
2	
) 	
	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

SELFASSESSMENT RATING FORM - 2017 GI SIMULATION COURSE

### **Competitiveness Scale**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I like competition	1	2	3	4	5
I am a competitive individual	1	2	3	4	5
I enjoy competing against an	1	2	3	4	5
opponent					
I don't like competing against	1	2	3	4	5
others					
I get satisfaction from	1	2	3	4	5
competing with others					
I find competitive situations	1	2	3	4	5
unpleasant					
I dread competing against	1	2	3	4	5
others	Ő.				
I try to avoid competing with	1	2	3	4	5
others					
I often try to outperform	1	2	3	4	5
others		4.			
I try to avoid arguments	1	2	3	4	5
I will do almost anything to	1	2	3	4	5
avoid an argument					
I often remain quiet rather	1	2	3	4	5
than risk hurting another					
person					
I don't enjoy challenging	1	2	3	4	5
others even when I think they					
are wrong					
In general, I will go along with	1	2	3	4	5
the group rather than create					
conflict					

Please rate the following items based on a 4-rar	nk scale.
= Not at all true 2= Hardly true 3= Moderately true	4= Exactly tru
	RATING
I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	
If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.	
It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	
I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	
Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	
I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	
I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	
When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	
If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.	
I can usually handle whatever comes my way.	

# **Gamification User Types Hexad Personal Questionnaire**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	More or less agree	Undecided	More or less disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
It makes me happy if I am able to help others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like helping others to orient themselves in new situations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like sharing my knowledge	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The wellbeing of others is important to me	Re	2	3	4	5	6	7
	C						
Interacting with others is important to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like being part of a team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is important to me to feel like I am part of a community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I enjoy group activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
				0			
It is important to me to follow my own path	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I often let my curiosity guide me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like to try new things	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Being independent is important to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like defeating obstacles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is important to me to always	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

#### Page 19 of 67

#### BMJ Open

#### SELFASSESSMENT RATING FORM - 2017 GI SIMULATION COURSE

19 of 67	BMJ Open							
	SELFASSES	SMENT RAT	ING FORM	1 - 2017 GI SII	MULATION	COURSE		
It is difficult for me to let go of a problem before I have found a	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
solution I like mastering difficult tasks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
I like to provoke	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
I like to question the status quo	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
I see myself as a rebel	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
I dislike following rules	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
I like competitions where a prize can be won	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Rewards are a great way to motivate me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
If the reward is sufficient I will put in effort	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Return of investment is important to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
For peer revi	ew only - http:	://bmjopen.br	nj.com/site/	about/guidelin	es.xhtml			



# **Endoscopy Knowledge Post-Test**

This is the knowledge test for the University of Toronto endoscopic simulation course. Please type in your "endo" number to begin the test. The test consists of 17 questions for a total of 20 points.

The knowledge questions are on the next two pages. You have 30 minutes to answer these questions.

These answers are confidential, and your responses and score are only for the purposes of our research studies. They will not be used as part of your residency training assessments, or as part of competency assessments.

#### \*Required

1. Please type in your "endo" number login to start \*

ie, "Endo10"

### Endoscopic Knowledge Test (page 1 of 2)

#### 2. Question 1 (1 point)

Name the endoscopic device depicted below. *Mark only one oval.* 

- 🔵 A. Endoloop
  - ) B. Endoscopic snare
  - C. Endoscopic biopsy forceps
  - D. Gold probe
  - ) E. Oval probe



### 3. Question 2 (1 point)

What type of sigmoid colon loop is most beneficial for entry into the descending colon? *Mark only one oval.* 

- A. Alpha-loop
- B. Reverse alpha-loop
- C. Gamma-loop
- ) D. N-loop
- E. Reverse-N loop

### 4. Question 3 (1 point)

Below is an endoscopic image of the larynx taken with a gastroscope. Which location is representative of the ideal place to position the gastroscope to intubate the esophagus? *Mark only one oval.* 

A	$\bigcirc$	
В	$\bigcirc$	
С	$\bigcirc$	
D	$\bigcirc$	



#### 5. Question 4 (1 point)

Which of the images below is an endoscopic image of the cecum? *Mark only one oval.* 



For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



### 6. Question 5 (1 point)

The pit pattern of polyps is commonly used as an endoscopic classification to determine the likely histopathology. What is the name of the classification most commonly used for pit patterns? *Mark only one oval.* 



- A. Kudo classification
- B. Maclean classification
- C. Yoshida classification
- D. Haggitt classification
- E. Sarin classification

### 7. Question 6 (1 point)

The pit patterns of the polyp depicted below have been enhanced by use of ambient light of bluegreen wavelength (approximately 450 - 540 nm). What is the name of this technology? *Mark only one oval.* 

- A. Confocal microscopy
- B. Optical coherence tomography
- C. Chromoendoscopy
- D. FICE (Fuji intelligent chromoendoscopy)
- ) E. Narrow band imaging



### 8. Question 7 (1 point)

With a well prepared colonoscopy to the cecum performed by an experienced endoscopist, what is the approximate risk of missed advanced neoplasia? *Mark only one oval.* 



В.	3-5%	0

C. 5-10%

D. >10%

#### 9. Question 8 (1 point)

Below is an endoscopic view of a patient's esophagus. What is the endoscopic diagnosis? *Mark only one oval.* 

- A. Eosinophilic esophagitis
  - B. Radiation esophagitis
  - C. Mosaic esophagus
  - ) D. Barrett's esophagus
- E. Diffuse-type squamous cell carcinoma

For peer review o



### Endoscopy knowledge test (page 2 of 2)

### 10. Question 9 (1 point)

Which of the following is a commonly used bowel preparation score for colonoscopy? *Mark only one oval.* 

- A. Los Angeles bowel preparation score
- ) B. Ottawa bowel preparation score
- C. King's College bowel preparation score
- ) D. Chicago bowel preparation score
- E. Washington bowel preparation score

### **Question 10 (4 points)**



# Identify the labelled parts of the colonoscope head (4 points; 0.5 points each)



18.	н
-	
Qu	estion 11 (1 point)
Cert the p endo	ain skills necessary for endoscopic performance may be independent of the technical performar procedure. Name four non-technical skills that you would view as important in the performance c oscopic procedures.
19.	Α
20.	В
21	C
22.	D
23	Question 12 (1 point)
20.	Which of the following is not a risk factor for colonic perforation at the time of colonoscopy Mark only one oval.
	A. Barotrauma
	B. Mucosal injection
	<ul><li>B. Mucosal injection</li><li>C. Sigmoid looping</li></ul>
	<ul> <li>B. Mucosal injection</li> <li>C. Sigmoid looping</li> <li>D. Trainee endoscopist performing colonoscopy</li> </ul>

### 24. Question 13 (1 point)

A 50 year old patient presents for a screening colonoscopy to your open access endoscopy unit. They have completed a 4L bowel preparation. Upon taking a history, you discover that they had a colonoscopy 2 years ago to work up anorectal bleeding but you don't have the results. What is the appropriate course of action? Mark only one oval.

A. Complete a screening colonoscopy because the indication of colorectal cancer screening is different than anorectal bleeding.

B. Another screening colonoscopy is not needed; send patient home.

C. Make concerted effort to track down report of prior colonoscopy and if not obtained, then proceed with screening colonoscopy.

D. Make concerted effort to track down report of prior colonoscopy and if not obtained, then explain to patient that they can choose to defer procedure until report is obtained and reviewed

E. Your endoscopic skills exceed that of the previous endoscopist and the procedure must be repeated.

### 25. Question 14 (1 point)

A unilingual Azerbaijani woman comes in for a gastroscopy to work up epigastric pain. She is unable to understand the consent process, which of the following is most correct? Mark only one oval.

- A. Do a physical examination; if she has abdominal discomfort, continue with gastroscopy.
- B. Ask the patient's daughter to translate the consent form.
- C. Reschedule the gastroscopy and ask her to bring a translator.
- D. Reschedule the gastroscopy and arrange for a translator to accompany her.
- E. Obtain consent from daughter and proceed with procedure

### 26. Question 15 (1 point)

You are completing a screening colonoscopy and discover a 12 mm pedunculated polyp in the transverse colon. The endoscopy nurse suggests the use of a 10 mm snare and no electrocautery, but you believe a 15 mm snare with electrocautery would be more appropriate. What do you do? Mark only one oval.

A. Take the nurse's suggestion since he/she is more experienced than yourself.



B. Use a 15 mm snare and ignore the nurse.

C. Ask the nurse for the rationale for the smaller snare and the absence of cautery and verbalize your decision to proceed with the 15 mm snare with cautery.

D. Discuss with the nurse why you wish to proceed with the larger snare and electrocautery before proceeding with the polypectomy.

	Ε.	Call	in	ć

a colleague to assist in the decision making.

### Endoscopy Knowledge Post-Test

#### 27. Question 16 (1 point)

You are completing a polypectomy of a 2 cm Paris II-a (flat) polyp in the cecum of a 65 year old male. After the polypectomy you notice a perforation in the cecum. You aim to close the defect with endoclips, start antibiotics, and arrange imaging and possible surgery. Which of the following would not be appropriate? *Mark only one oval.* 

- A. Start the plan above for the management of the patient's complication, as soon as possible.
  - B. Inform family members of the procedure's complications before proceeding with the above
  - C. Ensure airway, breathing and circulation are intact above all else.
  - D. Call for extra assistance into the room as soon as possible.
  - ) E. Stay calm as you manage the situation.

#### 28. Question 17 (1 point)

plan.

You perform a screening colonoscopy on an anemic 50 year old male who complains of weight loss, altered bowel habits and blood in his stool. You identify the patient is suffering from colorectal cancer. Which one of the following would not be appropriate in explaining the results of the colonoscopy to the patient?

Mark only one oval.

- A. Ensure the results are delivered in a private setting
- B. Do not inform the patient of the suspected diagnosis until you have the pathology results
- C. Ensure to be empathetic during delivery of the results of the colonoscopy
- D. Establish that the patient understands the results after you explain it to them
- E. Be aware of the patient's reaction and tone as you are delivering the news

### TEAMSTEPPS TEAMWORK ATTITUDES QUESTIONNAIRE

With respect to how each question applies to interactions with a team in ENDOSCOPY, please respond to the questions below by placing a checkmark in the box that corresponds to your level of agreement from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. We realize that the questions may be a little vague but please select only one response for each question.

### **Team Structure**

# 29. 1. It is important to ask patients and their families for feedback regarding patient care before/in/after endoscopy \*

Mark only one oval.

Strong disagree

- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

30 2 Patients are a critical co	omnonent of the care	toam in surgery a	hd andosconv *
	omponent of the care	team in surgery a	

Mark only one oval.

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 0	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
27	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
20	
20	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
52	
22	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	

60

$\supset$	Strong disagree
	Disagree

- > Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- 31. 3. The Department of Surgery or Division of Gastroenterology influences the success of direct care teams in surgery and endoscopy \*

Mark only one oval.

- Strong disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
  - ) Strongly agree
- 32. 4. In surgery and endoscopy, the mission of the team is of greater value that the goals of individual team members \*

Mark only one oval.

$\bigcirc$	Strong disagree
$\bigcirc$	Disagree
$\bigcirc$	Neutral
$\bigcirc$	Agree

- ) Strongly agree
- 33. 5. Effective team members can anticipate the needs of other team members \*

Mark only one oval.

- Strong disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- 34. 6. High-performing teams in health care share common characteristics with high-performing teams in other industries \*

Mark only one oval.

- Strong disagree Disagree Neutral Agree
  - ) Strongly agree

### Leadership

St	rong disagree
	sagree
	eutral
	iree
⊖ St	rongly agree
6. <b>8. Leader</b> Mark only	s should create informal opportunities for team members to share information *
◯ St	rong disagree
	sagree
N€	eutral
	iree
St	, rongly agree
37. <b>9. Effecti</b> '	ve leaders view honest mistakes as meaningful learning opportunities *
Mark only	one oval.
St	rong disagree
	sagree
◯ Ne	eutral
C Ag	jree
St	rongly agree
38. <b>10. It is a</b> Mark only	leader's responsibility to model appropriate team behaviour * one oval.
St	rong disagree
Di	sagree
N€	eutral
O Aç	jree
St	rongly agree

39.	11. It is important for surgeon-leaders or endoscopy-leaders to take time to discuss their team
	members' plans for each patient *
	Mark only one oval.

$\bigcirc$	
$\bigcirc$	Disagree
$\bigcirc$	Neutral
$\bigcirc$	Agree
$\bigcirc$	Strongly agree
40. <b>12. Te</b>	am leaders should ensure that team members help each other out when necessary *
Mark o	only one oval.
$\bigcirc$	Strong disagree
$\bigcirc$	Disagree
$\bigcirc$	Neutral
$\bigcirc$	Agree
$\bigcirc$	Strongly agree

### Situation monitoring

) Strong disagree

(

41. 13. Individuals can be taught how to scan the patient environment in the OR or procedure room for important situation cues. \*

Mark only one oval.



- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree
- 42. 14. Monitoring patients provides an important contribution to the effective performance of the team \*

Mark only one oval.

- Strong disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

f <sub>7</sub> 67	End Stopy Phone Post-Test
	43. 15. Even individuals who are not part of the direct care team should be encouraged to scan for
	and report changes in patient status *
	Disagree
	Neutral
	Agree
	Strongly agree
	44. 16. It is important to monitor the emotional and physical status of other team members *
	Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Disagree
	Neutral
	Agree
	Strongly agree
	45. 17. It is appropriate for one team member to offer assistance to another who may be too tired or stressed to perform a task *
	Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Disagree
	Neutral
	Agree
	Strongly agree
	46. 18. Team members who monitor their emotional and physical status on the job are more
	Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Neutral
	Agree
	Strongly agree
	Mutual support

17	Endoscopy Knowledge Post-Test
	$47.$ 19. To be effective, team members should understand the work of their fellow team members. $^{st}$
	Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Disagree
	Neutral

- Agree
- Strongly agree

#### 48. 20. Asking for assistance from a team member us a sign that that individual does not know how to do his/her job effectively \*

Mark only one oval.

- Strong disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
  - Strongly agree

#### 49. 21. Providing assistance to team members is a sign that an individual does not have enough work to do \*

Mark only one oval.

$\bigcirc$	Strong	disagree

- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

### 50. 22. Offering to help a fellow team member with his/her individual work tasks is an effective tool for improving team performance \*

Mark only one oval.

- Strong disagree
- Disagree
  - Neutral
  - Agree
- Strongly agree

Page 35 0f 67	Endoscopy Chewledge Post-Test
1	51. 23. It is appropriate to continue to assert a patient safety concern until you are certain that it has been heard. *
2	Mark only one oval.
3	Strong disagree
4 5	
6	
7	
8 9	
10	Strongly agree
11 12	
13	52. 24. Personal conflicts between team members do not affect patient safety ^
14	
15 16	Strong disagree
17	Disagree
18 10	Neutral
20	Agree
21	Strongly agree
22 23	
24	O a manuficientia a
25	Communication
26 27	
28	53. 25. Teams that do not communicate effectively significantly increase their risk of committing
29 30	Mark only one oval
31	
32	Strong disagree
33 34	Disagree
35	Neutral
36	Agree
37 38	Strongly agree
39	
40 41	54. 26. Poor communication is the most common cause of reported errors *
42	Mark only one oval.
43	Strong disagree
44 45	
46	Neutral
47 48	
49	
50	
51	
53	
54	
56	
57	
58 50	
60	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

	Endoscopy Rhowledge Post-Test
55. <b>27.</b> A their	Adverse events may be reduced by maintaining an information exchange with patients a · families *
Mark	only one oval.
(	) Strong disagree
	Disagree
	) Neutral
	Aaree
	Strongly agree
56. <b>28. l</b> Mark	prefer to work with team members who ask questions about information I provide *
$\square$	) Strong disagree
	Disagree
	) Neutral
	Agree
	) Strongly agree
	Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly agree
58. <b>30. l</b> Mark	t is nearly impossible to train individuals how to be better communicators *
	) Strong disagree
	Disagree
	) Neutral
	Agree
	) Strongly agree
59. Plea spac	se indicate any additional comments in the ce below.
Thank	ts for your participation.

### Page 37.0f-67

Powered by

BMJ Open

1 Endoscopist Participant ID #:	Date (DD/MM/YYYY):		Sta	art Time:	
2 3			Er	nd Time:	
<ul> <li><sup>4</sup></li> <li>5 Assessor: Self-Assessment</li> <li><sup>6</sup></li> <li>7 VR Case:</li> </ul>	VR Simulator (circle one):	1	2	3	

### ENDOSCOPIC NON-TECHNICAL SKILLS SELF-REFLECTION TOOL

Y / N

1. Did I take a focused patient history?	
2. Did I review the patient's medications (i.e. anticoagulants) and allergies?	
3. Did I identify the correct procedure and take an appropriate consent?	
4. Did I discuss the sedation plan with the anesthetist or RN?	
5. Did I introduce the team and myself to the patient?	
6. Did I discuss the procedure with the patient and address concerns?	
7. Did I ask the team if they were ready to start?	
8. Did I situate the patient in the correct position?	
9. Did I verbalize/acknowledge relevant anatomy/landmarks?	
10. Did I check vital signs often (every few minutes)?	
11. Did I update the team and patient on the progress of the procedure?	
12. Did I address patient comfort (i.e. ask the patient where pain is) and enact a plan for a patient who was not comfortable?	
13. Did a secondary goal arise during the procedure (e.g. polypectomy)? Did I identify issues and problems that arose from this scenario? Did I verbalize the plan to attend to these?	
14. Did I use closed-loop communication when interacting with the team?	
15. Did I discuss results with the patient post-procedure (i.e. complication, what was found, etc.) and create a follow-up plan?	
16. Was I respectful toward the patient and team?	
17. Did I identify any errors I made afterward? If so what can I do to improve my performance?	






### **M-OSANTS – NON-TECHNICAL SKILLS**

3 4	SITUATIONAL AWARENESS: sample questions are listed below, give a global rating.								
5 6 7	1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent				
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Was the endoscopist able to remain aware of the patient's history (e.g. allergies, medications, etc.)? Did the endoscopist review procedural details prior to procedure (e.g. confirms correct procedure)? Did the endoscopist demonstrate procedural planning (e.g. identifies objectives for the procedure at the start)? Did the endoscopist collect and use information during the procedure (e.g. change in vital signs)? Did the endoscopist recognize the scope of practice (e.g. refrain from unfamiliar procedures/ interventions)? Did the endoscopist anticipate potential problems during the procedure while proposing suitable solutions (e.g. proactively apply loop reduction strategies)? Was the endoscopist mindful of procedure time? Did the endoscopist ensure that patient outcomes are met (e.g. maintain patient comfort)? Did the endoscopist anticipate needs of team members and of the patient (e.g. minimize patient anxiety)?								
19 20	DECISION MAKING: sa	ample questions ar	e listed below, giv	e a global rating.					
21 22	1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent				
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33	appropriate to endoscopist able to implement endoscopic and enhoused when making a decision (e.g. endosing equipment appropriate to endoscopist appearance)? Did the endoscopist confidently create a plan and articulate details of the plan to the team)? Did the endoscopist demonstrate understanding of the risks and benefits of an intervention/ maneuver (e.g. aware of bleeding risk due to polypectomy)? Did the endoscopist account for relevant patient information (e.g. mindful of contraindications)? Did the endoscopist appropriately delegate tasks to staff (e.g. requesting equipment from nurses)? Did the endoscopist enact a subsequent option if initial action unsuccessful? Did the endoscopist respond appropriately if the procedure extends out of the endoscopist's scope of practice (e.g. asking for assistance from senior staff)?								
34 35	COMMUNICATION: sa	mple questions are	listed below, give	a global rating.					
36 37 38	1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	ood 5 - Excellent				
<ol> <li>39</li> <li>40</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>43</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> </ol>	Was the endoscopist able to receive and respond to information from team members? Did the endoscopist actively limit distractions in the room (e.g. restricts cell phone use)? Did the endoscopist convey information using a closed-loop (e.g. confirms amount of sedation to be administered)? Did the endoscopist speak with clarity, while providing details when appropriate (e.g. requesting snare with specific size)? Did the endoscopist indicate a specific team member if there are multiple staff (e.g. addresses nurse by name)? Did the endoscopist use language appropriate for the recipient (e.g. minimizes medical jargon for patients)? Was the endoscopist aware of verbal tone and volume (e.g. speaks to staff in a respectful, collegial manner that can be heard)? Did the endoscopist relay findings to patient, including any adverse events (e.g. follow-up during aftercare)?								
50 51	LEADERSHIP: sample questions are listed below, give a global rating.								
52 53	1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent				
55 56 57 58 59 60	Was the endoscopist able to take responsibility for the process of the procedure (e.g. acknowledge mistakes)? Did the endoscopist direct the flow of the team process, including an appropriate delegation of labour (e.g. requesting that nurses attend to patient discomfort)? Did the endoscopist demonstrate confidence when leading the team, even under pressure (e.g. maintains composure during a bleed)? Did the endoscopist lead thecendescopio/pause?http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml								

1 - Fail       2 - Poor       3 - Average       4 - Very good       5 - Excellent         Id the endoscopist demonstrate a respectful and courteous attitude towards the patient and team members (e.g. introduce meel/herself to everyone in the room?       id the endoscopist adonated end mistakes during procedure?         id the endoscopist adonated end behalf of the patient?       id the endoscopist adonated end behalf of the patient?         id the endoscopist ensure follow-up and address patient (c.g., mindful of endoscopy unit time)?       id the endoscopist ensure follow-up and address patient concerns within appropriate environment (e.g. follow-up within off 'addicated clinical area!?)         id the endoscopist refrain from inappropriate conversations (e.g. does not discuss other patients during a procedure?)         id the endoscopist refrain from inappropriate conversations (e.g. does not discuss other patients during a procedure?)         id the endoscopist refrain from inappropriate conversations (e.g. does not discuss other patients during a procedure?)         id the endoscopist refrain from inappropriate conversations (e.g. does not discuss other patients during a procedure?)         id the endoscopist refrain from inappropriate conversations (e.g. does not discuss other patients during a rocedure?)         id the endoscopist date to act effectively within the team of nurses. technicians, management, and other physicians?         id the endoscopist date or advice from other team members?         id the endoscopist disper withingness to assign to these, if appropriate (e.g. when transferring a patient)?	PROFESSIONALISM:	sample questions a	are listed below, g	ive a global rating.	
Id the endoscopist demonstrate a respectful and courteous attitude towards the patient and team members (e.g. introduce meet/herself to everyone in the room?? If the endoscopist acknowledge mistakes during procedure? If the endoscopist advocate on behalf of the patient? If the endoscopist advocate on behalf of the patient? If the endoscopist ensure floub-up and address patient concerns within appropriate environment (e.g. follow-up within off decided clinical area!)? If the endoscopist refarms from inappropriate conversations (e.g. does not discuss other patients during a procedure)? If the endoscopist ensure floub-up and address patient concerns within appropriate environment (e.g. follow-up within off decided clinical area!)? If the endoscopist refarms from inappropriate conversations (e.g. does not discuss other patients during a procedure)? If the endoscopist ensure that the procedure adheres to best-practice guidelines (e.g. record quality metrics)? ENWVORK: sample questions are listed below, give a global rating. I - Fail 2 - Poor 3 - Average 4 - Very good 5 - Excellent are the average of the endoscopist advare of the roles of all members of the team (e.g. galesks in a collegial, respectful tore)? as the endoscopist advare of the roles of all members of the endoscopic tam? if the endoscopist display willinges to assist others. If appropriate (e.g. when transferring a patient)? If the endoscopist take into account feedback from other team members (e.g. listens to suggestions for equipment)? If the endoscopist take into account feedback from other team members (e.g. listens to suggestions for equipment)?	1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent
EAMWORK: sample questions are listed below, give a global rating.         1 - Fail       2 - Poor       3 - Average       4 - Very good       5 - Excellent         as the endoscopist able to act effectively within the team of nurses, technicians, management, and other physicians?       d the endoscopist demonstrate respect for all members of the team (e.g. speaks in a collegial, respectiul tone)?         as the endoscopist demonstrate respect for all members of the team (e.g. when transferring a patient)?       d the endoscopist demonstrate respect for all members?         d the endoscopist demonstrate respect for all members?       f due provide (e.g. when transferring a patient)?         d the endoscopist display willingness to assist others, if appropriate (e.g. when transferring a patient)?         d the endoscopist take into account feedback from other team members (e.g. listens to suggestions for equipment)?	d the endoscopist demons mself/herself to everyone in d the endoscopist acknowl d the endoscopist display of d he endoscopist advocate d the endoscopist manage d the endoscopist ensure f dedicated clinical area)? d the endoscopist refrain fr d the endoscopist ensure t	trate a respectful and conn the room)? ledge mistakes during permetative on behalf of the patient e on behalf of the patient time appropriately (e.g. follow-up and address performing propriate convertional the procedure adhe	purteous attitude toward rocedure? (e.g. responds to patien t? . mindful of endoscopy atient concerns within a ersations (e.g. does not res to best-practice guid	ds the patient and team at discomfort)? unit time)? appropriate environment discuss other patients o delines (e.g. record qua	members (e.g. introduces (e.g. follow-up within offic luring a procedure)? lity metrics)?
1 - Fail     2 - Poor     3 - Average     4 - Very good     5 - Excellent	EAMWORK: sample o	questions are liste	d below, give a glo	obal rating.	
Tas the endoscopist able to act effectively within the team of nurses, technicians, management, and other physicians? Id the endoscopist demonstrate respect for all members of the team (e.g. speaks in a collegial, respectful tone)? Id the endoscopist ask of advice from other team members? Id the endoscopist ask for advice from other team members? Id the endoscopist take into account feedback from other team members (e.g. listens to suggestions for equipment)? Id the endoscopist take into account feedback from other team members (e.g. listens to suggestions for equipment)? Id the endoscopist take into account feedback from other team members (e.g. listens to suggestions for equipment)? Id the endoscopist take into account feedback from other team members (e.g. listens to suggestions for equipment)? Id the endoscopist take into account feedback from other team members (e.g. listens to suggestions for equipment)? Id the endoscopist take into account feedback from other team members (e.g. listens to suggestions for equipment)? Id the endoscopist take into account feedback from other team feedback feed	1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent
	a the endoscopist demons as the endoscopist aware d the endoscopist display v d the endoscopist ask for a d the endoscopist take into	trate respect for all men of the roles of all memb willingness to assist othe advice from other team i account feedback from	neers of the team (e.g. s ers of the endoscopic te ers, if appropriate (e.g. members? n other team members (	speaks in a collegial, reseam? when transferring a pati e.g. listens to suggestic	spectrul tone)? ent)? ons for equipment)?

BMJ Open SPPRETEST – ASSESSOR RATING FORM - 2017 GI SIMULATION COURSE

Endo	scopist	Particip	oant ID #:	Date (DD/MM/YYYY):		(	Star	t Tin	ne: _	
							End	Tim	ne:	
Assessor:				VR Simulator (circle one)	: 1	2		3		
VR C	ase: Po	olvpecto	my Case 3							
Maxir	nal dist	tance re	ached (check one):	Rectum	Hepatic	Flex	ure			
				Sigmoid	Ascend	ing C	olor	۱		
				Descending Colon	Cecum					
				Splenic Flexure	Termina	al lleu	ım			
			DC	<u> PS – TECHNICAL SKILLS</u>	5					
Pleas	se write	e the ap	propriate score fro	om the scale below						
Sc	cale:	4	Highly skilled perform	ance						
, )		3	Competent & safe thr	oughout procedure, no uncorrecte	d errors					
		2	Some standards not	yet met, aspects to be improved, s	ome erro	ors ur	ncorr	ecte	d	
		1	Accepted standards r	not yet met, frequent errors uncorr	ected					-
			CRI	<b>FERIA</b>			SCO	DRE		4
. <b>–</b>	ssess	ment, c	onsent, communic	ation						4
	• Obt	ains info	rmed consent using a	structured approach						
	0	Risk and	complications explained				2	2		
	0	Co-morb	idity			1	2	3	4	
	0	Sedation								
)	• Der	Opportur	nity for questions	s views and dignity during the proc	oduro	1	2	3	Λ	-
	Cor	nonsiraid nmunica	tes clearly with nation	t including outcome of procedure	with		2	5	-	-
	app	ropriate	management and follo	ow up plan. Full endoscopy report.	WILLI	1	2	3	4	
	Safety	and se	dation	; ; ;						
	Saf	e and se	cure IV access (or indi	cates need)		1	2	3	4	
	• Giv	es appro	priate dose of analges	sia and sedation and ensures ade	quate	1	2	3	4	
	оху	genation	and monitoring of par	tient (or indicates does, need for mon	itoring)	•	-	Ŭ	-	_
	• Der	nonstrate	es good communicatio	on with the nursing staff, including	5	1	2	3	4	
	dos	ages and	d vital signs	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
			AIIIS	a intubation (as indicates need to ab		4	2	2	4	-
		forme/le	diantage paged for DD		ECK)	1	2 2	<u>່</u> ວ	4	-
	o rer	ionns/In(	minal view (incerts in	luminal direction	ŀ	1 A	2	3 2	4	-
		mains IU		iummal direction	a the	1	2	3	4	-
	- Der	nonstrate	es awareness of palle nd takes appropriate :	nt's consciousness and pain durin	y ine	1	2	3	4	
	o Use	es torque	steering and control	knobs appropriately	ŀ	1	2	3	4	-
	o Use	es distens	sion, suction and lens	washing appropriately	F	1	2	3	4	-
	• Rec	cognizes	and logically resolves	loop formation	F	1	2	3	4	1
	o Use	es positio	on change and abdom	inal pressure to aid luminal views	F	1	2	3	4	1
	<ul> <li>Cor</li> </ul>	npletes r	procedure in reasonal	ble time	F	1	2	3	4	-
	Diagno	stic and	therapeutic ability	/		_	_	-		1
	• Ade	equate m	ucosal visualization			1	2	3	4	1
	Rec	coanizes	caecal/desc_colon la	ndmarks or incomplete examinatio	n <sup>†</sup>	1	2	3	4	-
	• Acc	curate ide	entification and manac	lement of pathology		1	2	3	4	-
	• Use	es diathe	rmy and therapeutic te	echniques appropriately and safely	,	1	2	3	4	<b>N//</b>
	Rec	coanizes	and Frazerestes isonably	cations and an are working and a second	guidelines	.xhtml	2	3	4	

2
3
Δ
5
2
6
7
8
٥.
3
10
11
12
13
14
14
15
16
17
18
10
19
20
21
22
22
25
24
25
26
27
20
28
29
30
31
27
52
33
34
35
36
22
3/
38
39
40
<u>4</u> 1
40
42
43
44
45
16
40
4/
48
49
50
51
51
52
53
54
55
55
20
57
58
59
60
0.0

#### Appendix X: Badge Table

Requirement Needed	Standardized Hints	Setting	Hour
Complete a case in less than a minute	Complete a case in less than a minute	Low fidelity	Hour 1
Complete Low Fidelity	Complete all Low fidelity cases	Low Fidelity	Hour 1
Proper Torque (as determined by assessor)	Torque properly	Low Fidelity	Hour 1
Less than 10% time in red- out	Be careful how much time in red out you spend.	Intro 3/4	Hour 2
Less than 90% Air left in colon	Remove an appropriate amount of air from the colon	Intro 3/4	Hour 2
Over 90% visualization	Make sure to have enough visualize the colon	Intro ¾	Hour 2
Identify the Ulcerative Colitis	ID a diagnosis	Intro 5	Hour 3
Identify pseudomembranous colitis	ID a diagnosis	Biopsy 3	Hour 3
Successful biopsy of Crohn's patient	Use the biopsy forceps	Poly 4	Hour 3 or 4
Take a Photo of a Pedunculated Polyp	Take photos	Poly 1	Hour 4
Identification of location of Polyp (splenic flexure or _cm in)	Say what you see	Poly 3	Hour 4
Outline major risks in colonoscopy	Pros and Cons	Integrated Scenarios	Hour 5/6
Minimum of 4/5 1. Infection 2. Perforation 3. Missed lesions 4. Sedation complications 5. Bleeding			
Pain acknowledgement (administration of meds, empathetic statement)	"Pain"	Integrated Scenarios	Hour 5/6

No time in extreme Pain	Patient comfort is important	Integrated Scenarios	Hour 5/6
Do an endoscopic Pause 1. Indicate a pause 2. Revise case 3. Feedback from SN	"Pause"	Integrated Scenarios	Hour 5/6
Retroflex without assistance	"Rectum"	High Fidelity	Any
Intubate the TI	Make sure you finish the whole pathway	High Fidelity	Any

\*Assessors please fill out

#### NURSE ASSESSED PATIENT COMFORT SCORE (NAPCOMS)

Domain	Item	0	1	2	3	Score
	1- Intensity	None or minimal	Mild	Moderate	Severe	
Pain	2- Frequency	None	Few (1 or 2 episodes)	Several times (3-4 episodes)	Frequent (>4 episodes)	
	3- Duration	None	Short duration (episode <30 seconds)	Moderate duration (30 sec-1 minute)	Long duration (episode lasts >1 min)	
	Total	Pain Score (I	ntensity + Frequ	uency + Durat	ion)	
Sedation	Level of consciousness*	Alert	Sleepy but initiates conversation	Responds only when asked or stimulated	Unresponsive or only responds with pronounced simulation	
Global	Tolerability*	Very well tolerated	Reasonably well tolerated	Just tolerated	Poorly tolerated	

\*Note: level of consciousness and tolerability are not used in overall score

COGNITIVE LOAD INDEX RATING FORM - 2017 GI SIMULATION COURSE

#### Cognitive Load Index for Colonoscopy

CRITERIA	SCORE
<b>Intrinsic load items:</b> Please rate your agreement with the following statements regarding the colonoscopy you've just completed. Please circle from 0 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree)	
1. Physically manipulating and controlling the colonoscope was difficult	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2. Using ancillary instruments (i.e. biopsy forceps, polypectomy snare) was difficult	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3. Identifying normal anatomy and/or landmarks was difficult	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4. The endoscopic findings were complex or difficult to characterize	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
5. It was difficult to manage identified pathology (i.e. polyps that were difficult to remove, bleeding that was difficult to control)	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
6. It was difficult to keep track of, or remember, all the endoscopic findings	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
7. Managing the patient's level of comfort was difficult	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
8. Overall, this colonoscopy was difficult and/or complex	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
<b>Extraneous load items:</b> Please rate your agreement with the following statements regarding your experience during the colonoscopy you've just completed. Please circle from 0 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree)	
1. My supervisor's instructions were unclear	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2. My supervisor used language that was confusing or unfamiliar	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3. The manner in which my superior provided instructions	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4. I felt distracted by other people present in the endoscopy room	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
5. I felt distracted by the environment (i.e. my pager going off, environmental noise)	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
6. I felt distracted by things on my mind unrelated to this colonoscopy	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
<b>Germane load items:</b> Please rate your agreement with the following statements regarding your level of mental effort during the colonoscopy you've just completed. Please circle from 0 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree)	
1. I invested substantial mental effort learning how to control or manipulate the colonoscope and/or other endoscopic equipment	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2. I invested substantial mental effort identifying or understanding colonic anatomy	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3. I invested substantial mental effort understanding, remembering and/or managing the endoscopic findings	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4. I invested substantial mental effort learning how to manage patient comfort level	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
5. Overall, I invested substantial mental effort learning during this colonoscopy	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

## St. Michael's

#### Inspired Care. Inspiring Science.

Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy: impact on clinical performance

#### **CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY**

This is a consent form regarding the above mentioned research study. Before you give your consent to voluntarily participate in this study, it is important that you read the following information and ask the study personnel as many questions as necessary to be sure you understand what you will be asked to do.

#### **Investigators**

Principal Investigator:

Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC Division of Gastroenterology St. Michael's Hospital 16-036 Cardinal Carter Wing 30 Bond Street Toronto, Ontario M5B 1W8 Phone: (416) 864-5628 Fax: (416) 864-5882 E-mail: grovers@smh.ca

Consent Form, Version Date: September 5, 2017 Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy: impact on clinical performance For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xntml

#### **Background and Purpose of the Study**

Colonoscopies are medical procedures that gastroenterology physicians and general surgeons learn during their residency training. Traditionally, these procedures are learned for the first time on patients in the clinical setting under the supervision of a fully-trained attending physician. Virtual reality (VR) has since been used to create devices, called endoscopic simulators that can emulate the look and feel of performing colonoscopies, and have been validated in research studies to confer basic skills to trainees. The optimal method to use virtual reality simulators for teaching trainees that have yet to begin procedures in colonoscopy has yet to be determined, and was identified by the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy as a need for further training.

The primary objective of this project is to evaluate the impact of a simulation-based training curriculum using gamification on clinical performance in colonoscopy.

#### <u>Eligibility</u>

You are asked to consider taking part in this study if you are a resident in General Surgery, Adult Gastroenterology or Pediatric Gastroenterology at the University of Toronto.

In order to be eligible for this study, you must be a post-graduate trainee in the above programs, must have completed less than 25 colonoscopic procedures, and must have completed less than 25 simulated colonoscopy procedures to date.

#### **Description of the Study**

We aim to recruit 36 postgraduate novice endoscopists from the Adult Gastroenterology, Pediatric Gastroenterology and General Surgery training programs at the University of Toronto. **Note:** this study takes place concurrently alongside the Annual Endoscopic Simulation Training Course. The study, as described below, is a randomized control trial that is investigating the effectiveness of a new simulation-based curriculum. The Annual Endoscopic Simulation Training Course is an educational program through the University of Toronto, which aims to teach novices how to perform colonoscopies. Participation in the study component is optional; if you chose to opt-out of the study, it <u>will not</u> impact your participation in the course.

You will be asked to take a written questionnaire at the start of the study to collect demographic and background information including: age, sex, level of training, previous endoscopy experience and nature of experience, and video game experience, which may correlate with baseline endoscopic skill.

Following this you will take part in a pre-test consisting of the following:

1. **Knowledge Test:** A 30 minute (17 questions) multiple-choice question test designed to assess participants' theoretical knowledge of colonoscopy, including indications, sedation, safety, findings, pathology and follow-up.

Consent Form, Version Date: September 5, 2017 Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy; impact on clinical performance For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 2. VR Simulation Test: This test will assess baseline endoscopic technical proficiency through the completion of a colonoscopy procedure on the VR simulator (EndoVR® Colonoscopy Module 3). This scenario simulates a screening colonoscopy, without the need for any type of intervention (such as biopsy). The time limit of the procedure will be 30 minutes. An expert rater will be present to assess performance, but will not provide assistance. You will be videotaped in order to obtain performance measures, such that your faces are not captured (to ensure anonymity). Prior to starting the procedure, you will complete a questionnaire to measure self-efficacy.

3. VR Simulation Based "Integrated Scenario" Test: Following the simulatoronly test, participants will complete an Integrated Scenario format test to assess their baseline endoscopic non-technical proficiency. This simulated procedure will mimic the setup of an endoscopic suite, as the VR simulator will be positioned next to a patient bed. A standardized patient, who will receive instructions regarding their medical role, will act out a scenario on colon cancer screening. You will be expected to explain the colonoscopy procedure, its benefits and risks, and to obtain procedural consent. You will then carry out the procedure on the VR simulator (EndoVR® Polypectomy Module #3) while responding to the patient and interacting with the standardized nurse (SN) as appropriate. The Standardized Patient (SP) will act out cues from the VR simulator if the simulator signals that the procedure has exceeded its threshold for discomfort. Your performance will be videotaped (in a manner that their faces are not captured to ensure anonymity) in order to obtain performance measures. You will be given a maximum of 45 minutes to complete the procedure.

You will then be randomized, using an online randomization algorithm, to one of two groups:

**Control Group:** This group will receive 4 hours of interactive small-group 1. didactic and hands-on sessions. During these sessions, participants will focus on learning about the theory of colonoscopy, including related concepts of pathology, anatomy, and therapeutic technique. The last session will focus on non-technical skills (NTS) relevant to endoscopy (situation awareness, decision making, communication, teamwork, and leadership) and how they relate to clinical performance. During this session, participants will also watch a video that demonstrates an ideal endoscopic procedure in terms of NTS. as well as learn about the "E-NTS Checklist", which will be provided for them to later use during the integrated scenario training. This checklist has been developed according to evidence-based recommendations and targets non-technical skills. After each didactic session, a short MCQ based on the topics covered in that session will be administered, in keeping with suggestions from the literature regarding "test-enhanced learning". In addition to didactic training, the control group will be given six hours of expert-assisted instruction on both the low-fidelity simulator (1 hour) and on the high-fidelity VR simulator (5 hours). Six modules of increasing difficulty in colonoscopy and colonoscopic polypectomy will be taught using one-on-one feedback from an expert academic endoscopist. The endoscopy instructor will demonstrate techniques, answer

Consent Form, Version Date: September 5, 2017 Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy; impact on clinical performance For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

questions and provide individualized performance feedback on global performance, with a focus on non-technical skills. During training on the high-fidelity simulator, the last two hours will take the form of the integrated scenario, which will feature a standardized patient (SP) and standardized nurse (SN). Terminal feedback will be given after each integrated scenario by the instructor. Finally, the "E-NTS Checklist" will be accessible during training in the integrated scenario, as participants can view the checklist prior to each case and review it after the case.

2. **Intervention Group:** This group will receive the same 4 hours of didactic teaching, and hands-on sessions. The intervention group will also receive the same teaching on both the low-fidelity and high-fidelity simulators. Within the context of the didactic sessions and simulator training, the GIC group will engaged in "gamified practice" in two ways. First, leaderboards will also be used to track and rank participants' performances. Prior to training, participants in the GIC group will watch a tutorial video on the functionality of the leaderboards and subsequently receive an anonymized ID tag that can be used to identify only their position on the leaderboard. Participants will also be informed that awards will be given to the individual who achieves first place. An "introductory" leaderboard, based on technical skills performance during the low-fidelity simulator practice, will be used to familiarize participants with the function of the leaderboard. After practice on the low-fidelity simulator is completed, participants will be introduced to the leaderboard for performance on the VR simulator and didactic sessions. Specifically, this leaderboard will include 4 components: a non-technical skills score, a technical skills score, a cognitive skills score, and an overall ranking, which will be determined through an algorithm that accounts for non-technical, technical and cognitive scores. Scoring of the non-technical and technical skills will be based on assessed performances during practice sessions on the VR simulator using the M-OSANTS and JAG-DOPS, respectively, while the scoring of the cognitive skills will be based on percentage scores of the MCO from the didactic sessions. Scores will be aggregated only from participants training on the same days. The leaderboard will be displayed on a central laptop and/or TV screen and will be accessible at any time throughout the day. Finally, participants in the GIC group will have the opportunity to be rewarded for their performances. One method of reinforcing good performance will be through achievement badges. These badges will be awarded after each scenario on the high-fidelity simulator and will be based on completion, proper technique, and/ or correct identification of pathology. Additionally, the participant who has accumulated the most badges will be awarded a prize.

A post-test will be administered after completion of the training period to compare learning between the two groups, consisting of:

#### 1. Knowledge Test

Knowledge acquisition will be evaluated using a 30 minute (17 questions) multiplechoice question test designed to assess theoretical knowledge of colonoscopy.

#### 2. Simulation-based Assessment

Consent Form, Version Date: September 5, 2017 Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy; impact on clinical performance For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

You will be assessed through the completion of a colonoscopy procedure on the VR simulator. As with the pre-test, the post-test will include an "integrated scenario" which links a standardized patient with the VR colonoscopy simulator. You will once again be required to explain the procedure, its benefits and risks, and obtain informed consent. You will then carry out the procedure on the simulator while responding to the patient as appropriate. Once again, the performance of all participants will be videotaped, such that their faces are not captured to ensure anonymity, in order to obtain performance measures.

#### 3. Patient-based transfer test

You will then be contacted to undertake two colonoscopies on real patients. These procedures will be videotaped in a manner that anonymizes you and the patient. The videotapes will be assessed by two independent blinded expert endoscopists.

#### Potential Harms (Injury/Discomfort/Inconvenience)

There are no known harms associated with participation in this study.

#### **Potential Benefits**

You will not receive credit in performing colonoscopies by participating in this study. You may receive no direct benefits from being in this study. Results from this study will be used to adjust the structure and format of the current University of Toronto virtualreality colonoscopy training curriculum for novice endoscopic trainees.

#### **Confidentiality and Privacy**

All the persons associated with this study, including the study investigators and delegates (study team) are committed to respecting your privacy. No information that discloses your identity will be published or released to any other persons without your consent unless required by law.

Video-recordings of your face are considered to be identifying personal information and will not be shown when videotaping these procedures. During the video-recordings, you are requested not to state your name or the names of anyone else or any institutions. However if this does happen, you should know that the audio track from the video will be removed so identifying information is removed.

Any records, documentation, or information related to you will be coded by study numbers to ensure that persons outside of the study will not be able to identify you. All study data forms will be identified by study code number and not by name. No identifying information about you will be allowed off site. All information that identifies you and study data will be securely stored at St. Michael's Hospital. The video recordings will be securely destroyed after data collection. Other identifying information will be securely destroyed after all the colonoscopy procedures have been completed. The study data will be securely destroyed when the study results have been published, within five years after completion of the study.

It is important to understand that despite these protections being in place, experience in similar studies indicates that there is the risk of unintentional release of information. The principal investigator and study personnel will protect your records and keep all the information in your study file confidential to the greatest extent possible. The chance that this information will accidentally be given to someone else is minimal.

Data collected during this study will not form any part of your evaluation for the rotation and will not be forwarded to your program director or any other individual involved in your evaluation in residency. The study investigators will have access to the coded study data, but will not have access to your identifying information, including the videorecordings. The St. Michael's Hospital Research Ethics Board may have access to your identifying information and study data collected, for the purpose of study monitoring.

In no way does signing this consent form waive your legal rights nor release the investigators or involved institution from their legal and professional responsibilities.

#### Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal

Participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to decline participation in this study and to withdraw from the study at any time if you so desire. Whether you participate in this study or not, it will not have any effect on your clinical evaluations, or standing in your academic program at the University of Toronto, nor will it in any way affect your admission to (or current status in) a residency/fellowship program, nor your current or future employment at St. Michael's Hospital. If you withdraw or are withdrawn from the study, information gathered from you up to that point will be kept and used in the study, unless you request that it not be used, and we are able to remove it.

#### Study Results

We may present this study at a scientific conference and we intend to write an article about this study for a scientific journal. No identifying information about you will be revealed in any presentation or publication about the study. Study results will be communicated to you by request following completion of the study. You can ask for a copy of the published article by contacting Michael Scaffidi, Research Assistant, at (416) 864-5628 or by e-mail at <u>scaffidim@smh.ca</u>.

#### Potential Costs of Participant and Reimbursement to the Participant

Participating in this study will not result in any costs charged to you, and as such, no reimbursements or compensation will be provided.

#### <u>Sponsor</u>

 This study is funded by a grant from the University of Toronto.

#### **Compensation for Injury**

If you suffer a physical injury from (the procedure(s) or participation) in this study, medical care will be provided to you in the same manner as you would ordinarily obtain any other medical treatment. In no way does signing this form waive your legal rights nor release the study doctor(s), sponsors or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities.

#### Participation and Withdrawal

Participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to decline participation in this study and to withdraw from the study at any time if you so desire. Whether you participate in this study or not, it will not have any effect on your participation in the Annual Endoscopic Simulation Course, clinical evaluations, or standing in your academic program at the University of Toronto, nor will it in any way affect your admission to (or current status in) a residency/fellowship program, nor your current or future employment at St. Michael's Hospital. If you withdraw from the study, information gathered from you up to that point will be kept and used in the study, unless you request that it not be used, and we are able to remove it.

#### Can Participation in this Study End Early?

You can choose to end your participation in this study at any time. If you withdraw voluntarily from the study, you are encouraged to contact the Research Coordinator, Michael Scaffidi, Division of Gastroenterology (416-864-5628) immediately.

If you decide to leave the study, the information about you that was collected before you left the study will still be used. No new information will be collected without your permission.

The study investigators have the right to stop your participation in the study if it is not in your best interest to continue or if you do not follow study directions

#### **Research Ethics Board Contact**

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of the Research Ethics Board, St. Michael's Hospital at 416-864-6060 ext. 2557 during regular business hours.

The study protocol and consent form have been reviewed by a committee called the Research Ethics Board at St. Michael's Hospital. The Research Ethics Board is a group of scientists, medical staff, individuals from other backgrounds (including law and ethics) and members of the community. The committee is established by the hospital to review studies for their scientific and ethical merit. The Board pays special attention to the potential harms and benefits involved in participation to the research participant as well as the benefit to society. The committee is also required to do periodic reviews of ongoing research studies. As part of this review, someone may contact you form the Research Ethics Board to discuss your experience in the research study.

#### Study Contacts

If you require further information, or have any questions concerning this study, please contact the principal investigator:

Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC Division of Gastroenterology St. Michael's Hospital 16-036 Cardinal Carter Wing 30 Bond Street Toronto, Ontario M5B 1W8 Phone: (416) 864-5628 Fax: (416) 864-5882 E-mail: grovers@smh.ca

Collect calls will be accepted.

You may also contact the research assistant, Michael Scaffidi, at (416)-864-5628 or by email at <u>scaffidim@smh.ca</u>.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your own records.

5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

43 44 45

46

47 48

49 50 51

52

53

59

60

# Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy: impact on clinical performance

#### **Principal Investigator**

Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC Division of Gastroenterology St. Michael's Hospital 16-036 Cardinal Carter Wing 30 Bond Street Toronto, Ontario M5B 1W8 Phone: (416) 864-5628 Fax: (416) 864-5882 E-mail: grovers@smh.ca

#### **Declaration of Consent**

The research study has been explained to me, and any questions that I have asked about the study have been answered to my satisfaction. A member of the study team, who has no influence on my academic program, will be obtaining my consent form. I have the right not to participate and the right to withdraw from this study without affecting my participation in the Annual Endoscopic Simulation Course, evaluation or standing on my academic program at the University of Toronto, or any admission to (or current status in) a residency/fellowship program. I have also been informed that my choice will not affect my current or future employment at St. Michael's Hospital. As well, the potential harms and benefits (if any) of participating in this research study have been explained to me. I have been told that I have not waived my legal rights nor released the investigators or involved institution from their legal and professional responsibilities. I know that I may ask now, or in the future, any questions I have about the study. I have been told that records relating to me in this study will be kept confidential and that no information will be released or printed that would disclose my personal identity without my permission unless required by law. I have been given sufficient time to read the above information. I consent to participate in this study. I will be given a signed copy of this consent form.

Name of Participant (print)

Signature

Date

I have explained the study to the above-named participant and discussed the potential risks and benefits (if any) associated with participation in this research study. I have answered all questions asked with respect to this research study.

Name and Position of Person Conducting Consent Discussion (print) Signature of Person Consent Discussion Date

Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy; impact on clinical performance For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

### St. Michael's

Inspired Care. Inspiring Science.

#### Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy: impact on clinical performance

#### CONSENT FORM TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY Patient participants

This is a consent form regarding the above mentioned research study. A research study is a way of gathering information on a treatment, procedure or medical device or to answer a question about something that is not well understood. Before you give your consent to be a volunteer, it is important that you read the following information and ask as many questions as necessary to be sure you understand what you will be asked to do.

#### **Investigators**

Principal Investigator:

Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC Division of Gastroenterology St. Michael's Hospital 16-036 Cardinal Carter Wing 30 Bond Street Toronto, Ontario M5B 1W8 Phone: (416) 864-5628 Fax: (416) 864-5882 E-mail: grovers@smh.ca

#### **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

We have no known actual, apparent, potential or perceived conflicts of interest in conducting this study.

#### FUNDING SOURCE

This study is funded by a grant provided by the University of Toronto, Division of Gastroenterology.

#### **PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH**

You are being asked to consider participating in this study because you are booked to have a colonoscopy.

Colonoscopy is a technically challenging procedure and it requires considerable training to learn the skill. Increasingly trainees that learn these skills are learning them on high-fidelity virtual reality simulators that have been designed to teach colonoscopy, prior to performance on real patients. Although simulation-based practice is being integrated into endoscopy training curricula, there is no consensus on the best way to how to do this. One method that has been used in surgical simulation is to interlace a lecture-based curriculum with supervised procedures with feedback with experts. It is unknown whether this provides better learning than self-directed endoscopic procedural learning.

The purpose of this study is to compare performance on colonoscopies performed on a virtual reality endoscopic simulator between two groups of beginning endoscopists, one trained with a curriculum that using gamficiation and one trained with a curriculum that uses conventional simulationtraining.

#### **DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH**

#### WHAT WILL HAPPEN DURING THIS STUDY?

Two physician assessors will be asked to evaluate the performance of the physician performing your colonoscopy. In order to assess the performance, videotaping is required. The physicians will use standardized tests for performance of colonoscopy in order to perform the assessment. To ensure anonymity, your face and the endoscopist's face will not be recorded. Two views of the procedure will be captured at the same time: 1) a close-up view of the endoscopist's gloved hands using the control knobs and tube of the colonoscope and 2) the view obtained by the colonoscope's camera which shows the inside of the your bowel.

You will be asked, in person, to provide some personal health information including your age, gender, the reason why you having the colonoscopy procedure and if you have any history of a difficult colonoscopy or if you have had surgery in the past to remove part of your bowel.

#### HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?

It is anticipated that about 120 people (80 patients and 40 endoscopists) will participate in this study at St. Michael's Hospital. The study is expected to take three years to complete.

#### WHAT ARE THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF STUDY PARTICIPANTS?

All data will be collected during your scheduled colonoscopy procedure time. Participation in this study will take no additional time and the duration of your colonoscopy procedure itself will not be affected.

If you decide to participate in this study you will be asked to do the following:

(1) Provide one of the study investigators, in person, with some personal health information including your age, gender, the reason why you are having the colonoscopy procedure and if you have any history of a difficult colonoscopy or have had surgery in the past to remove part of their bowel.

(2) Agree to allow your colonoscopy procedure to be videotaped during this study. Your name and face will not be shown to the camera.

#### POTENTIAL HARMS (Injury, discomfort, inconvenience)

You may experience side effects from participating in this study. Some of these risks we know about. There is also the possibility of risk that we do not know about or have not seen in study subjects to date. Some of these can be managed. If you decide to take part in this study, you should contact Dr. Samir C. Grover (Division of Gastroenterology, St. Michael's Hospital, 416-864-5628) if you think you have side effects even if you think it has nothing to do with the study.

The risks we know of are:

There are no direct short- or long-term risks anticipated. Data collected will be kept completely confidential and anonymous. Even though the risk that a participant's data could become public is very small, it can never be completely eliminated. However, every precaution is taken to prevent this. Any data collected during the study (e.g. performance assessments, videotaped performance) will be identified using only an individualized number known only to the principal investigator (Drs. Grover) so that your privacy is protected.

#### POTENTIAL BENEFITS

There is no benefit to you from your participation in this study.

#### **PROTECTING YOUR INFORMATION**

You have the right to have any information about you that is collected, used or disclosed for this research study to be handled in a confidential manner. No information that discloses your identity may be released or published without your consent. All information obtained during the study will be held in strict confidence. Even though the risk that your data could become public is very small, it can never be completely eliminated. However, every precaution is taken to prevent this. Prior to starting the study, you will be assigned a unique code known only to the principal investigator (Dr. Grover) so that your privacy is protected. Any data collected during the study will be identified using only this code.

The file which links your unique study identifier with your name is the only source of information that could possibly be utilized, either alone or with other information, to identify you. This encrypted file will be kept behind locked doors in Dr. Samir Grover's office, St. Michael's Hospital until data analysis is complete (anticipated time frame: 5 years). After that time it will be securely destroyed as per hospital requirements. Only Dr. Grover (principal investigator) will have access to this file.

Any study data about you that is sent outside of the hospital will be aggregate data for research presentations and publications. No individual level data will be reported .

The investigator(s), study staff and the other people listed above will keep the information they see or receive about you confidential, including personal health information, to the extent permitted by applicable laws. Even though the risk of identifying you from the study data is very small, it can never be completely eliminated. Experience in similar studies indicates that the

greatest risk in this study to you is the unintentional release of information from your health records. The study doctor will protect your records and keep confidential all the information in your study file, including your name, address and telephone number. The chance that this information will accidentally be given to someone else is small.

You have the right to have any information about you and your health that is collected, used or disclosed for this research study to be handled in a confidential manner.

If you agree to join this study, the study doctor and his/her study team will look at your personal health information and collect only the information they need for the study. Personal health information is any information that could be used to identify you and includes your name, address, date of birth, new or existing medical records, that includes types, dates and results of medical tests or procedures.

Access to your personal health information will take place under the supervision of the Principal Investigator. The information that is collected for the study will be kept in a locked and secure area by the study doctor for 5 years. Only the study team or the people or groups listed below will be allowed to look at your records. Your participation in this study also may be recorded in your medical record at this hospital.

The following people may come to the hospital to look at the study records and at your personal health information to check that the information collected for the study is correct and to make sure the study followed proper laws and guidelines:

• Representatives of the St. Michael's Hospital Ethics Board, a group of people who oversee the ethical conduct of research studies at St. Michael's Hospital

The investigators plan to publish the results of this study. You will not be named in any reports, publications, or presentations that my come from this study. Only group data will be presented.

#### STUDY RESULTS

As mentioned, the investigators plan to publish the results of this study. Once the study has been completed, you can contact Dr. Samir C. Grover (416-864-5628) to obtain a copy of the results.

#### POTENTIAL COSTS OF PARTICIPATION AND REIMBURSEMENT TO THE PARTICIPANT

You will not have to pay for any of the procedures involved in this study. There is no reimbursement associated with participation in this study.

#### **COMPENSATION FOR INJURY**

If you suffer a physical injury from participation in this study, medical care will be provided to you in the same manner as you would ordinarily obtain any other medical treatment. In no way does signing this form waive your legal rights nor release the study investigators, sponsors, or other involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities.

#### PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

Participation in any research study is voluntary. If you choose to participate in this study, you can change your mind without reason and withdraw from the study any time up to 5 years. After 5 years, your data will be anonymized and it will no longer be possible to identify which data are yours. In addition, it you decide to decline participation or withdraw from the study at any time, this will have no impact on the care you or your family will receive at St. Michael's Hospital.

#### **CAN PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY END EARLY?**

You can choose to end your participation in this study at any time. If you withdraw voluntarily from the study, you are encouraged to contact Dr. Samir C. Grover, Division of Gastroenterology (416-864-5628) immediately.

If you decide to leave the study, the information about you that was collected before you left the study will still be used. No new information will be collected without your permission.

The study investigators have the right to stop your participation in the study if it is not in your best interest to continue or if you do not follow study directions.

#### **RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD CONTACT**

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact Chair of the Research Ethics Board at 416-864-6060 ext. 2557 during business hours.

The study protocol and consent form have been reviewed by a committee called the Research Ethics Board at St. Michael's Hospital. The Research Ethics Board is a group of scientists, medical staff, individuals from other backgrounds (including law and ethics) and members of the community. The committee is established by the hospital to review studies for their scientific and ethical merit. The Board pays special attention to the potential harms and benefits involved in participation to the research participant as well as the benefit to society. The committee is also required to do periodic reviews of ongoing research studies. As part of this review, someone may contact you form the Research Ethics Board to discuss your experience in the research study.

#### **STUDY CONTACTS**

If you have any questions, concerns or would like to speak to the study team for any reason, please call Dr. Samir C. Grover at 416-864-5628.

#### **INFORMED CONSENT**

Study Title: Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy: impact on clinical performance

Principal investigator:

Dr. Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC
Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Medicine
St. Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto
416-864-5628 (available Mon to Fri 9:00 AM – 5:00 PM)

The research study has been explained to me and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have been informed of the alternatives to participation in this study. I have the right not to participate and the right to withdraw without affecting the quality of medical care at St. Michael's Hospital for me and for other members of my family. As well, the potential harms and benefits (if any) of participating in this research study have been explained to me. I have been told that I have not waived my legal rights nor released the investigators, sponsors, or involved institutions of their legal and professional responsibilities. I know that I may ask now, or in the future, any questions I have about the study. I have been told that study records relating to me will be kept confidential and that no information will be disclosed without my permission unless required by law. I have been given sufficient time to read the above information.

I consent to participate. I have been told that I will be given a signed copy of this consent form.

Signature

Date

I **agree** to allow my colonoscopy procedure to be videotaped during this study as described in this consent form.

I **do not agree** to allow my colonoscopy procedure to be videotaped during this study as described in this consent form.

Person obtaining consent

By signing this form, I confirm that:

• This study and its purpose has been explained to the participant named above

- All questions asked by the participant have been answered
- I will give a copy of this signed and dated document to the participant

Name of person obtaining	Signature	Date
consent (print)		
ASSISTANCE DECLARATION	$\Box$ (check here if not applicable)	

Consent form (patient) Version Date 2017 July 24 2017 Page 6 of 7 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml The participant/substitute decision-maker was assisted during the consent process as follows

2
2
5
4
5
c
0
7
8
0
9
10
11
10
12
13
1/
14
15
16
17
17
18
19
20
20
21
22
23
24
25
20
26
27
28
20
29
30
21
51
32
33
24
54
35
36
27
37
38
39
40
40
41
42
. <u>-</u> 12
43
44
45
16
40
47
48
10
49
50
51
57
52
53
54
57
55
56
57
57
58
59

60

(please check the relevant box and	complete the signature space	below):	
The person signing below acted and attests that the study as set out questions answered	as a translator for the partici in this form was accurately t	ipant during the const ranslated and has had	ent process l any
I have been requested to interpret th (). of choice of the potential participan research study. I agree to keep cor I have interpreted the consent discu own language that he/she has been his/her participation, including the consent to participate in this study.	he consent discussion for the I am competent in the Eng at (	potential research pa lish language and in ). I am not invol ation of the potential pant has advised me in study, the nature and l participant freely gi	articipant the language ved in the participant. n his/her extent of ves his/her
Printed Name of Interpreter	Signature	of Interpreter	Date
Relationship or Position of Interpreter	Contact Information of Int	erpreter sion-maker, and the p	person
signing below attests that the study the participant/substitute decision-r	was accurately explained to, naker.	, and apparently unde	erstood by,
	(	2	Print
Name of Witness	Signature	1	Date
Relationship to Participant			

 BMJ Open



SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents\*

Section/item	ltem No	Description
Administrative in	format	ion
Title	1	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, intervention and, if applicable, trial acronym
Trial registration	2a	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry
	2b	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set
Protocol version	3	Date and version identifier
Funding	4	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support
Roles and	5a	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors
responsibilities	5b	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor
	5c	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the rep and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whet they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities
	5d	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)
Introduction		
Background and rationale	6a	Description of research question and justification for undertaking th trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention
	6b	Explanation for choice of comparators
Objectives	7	Specific objectives or hypotheses
Trial design	8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework (

1 2	
3 4	
5	
7	
8 9	
10 11	
12 13	
14	
16	
17 18	
19 20	
21 22	
23 24	
25	
20	
28 29	
30 31	
32 33	
34 35	
36	
38	
39 40	
41 42	
43 44	
45 46	
47	
40 49	
50 51	
52 53	
54 55	
56 57	
58	
59 60	

Methods: Partici	pants,	interventions, and outcomes
Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained
Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)
Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered
	11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease)
	11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return, laboratory tests)
	11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial
Outcomes	12	Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific measurement variable (eg, systolic blood pressure), analysis metric (eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of aggregation (eg, median, proportion), and time point for each outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen efficacy and harm outcomes is strongly recommended
Participant timeline	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for participants. A schematic diagram is highly recommended (see Figure)
Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study objectives and how it was determined, including clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any sample size calculations
Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach target sample size
Methods: Assigr	nment	of interventions (for controlled trials)
Allocation:		
Sequence generation	16a	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg, computer- generated random numbers), and list of any factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg, blocking) should be provided in a separate document that is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign interventions

1 2 3 4 5	Allocation concealment mechanism	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg, central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the sequence until interventions are assigned
6 7 8	Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol participants, and who will assign participants to interventions
9 10 11 12	Blinding (masking)	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and how
14 15 16 17		17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's allocated intervention during the trial
18	Methods: Data co	llectio	n, management, and analysis
20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Data collection methods	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other trial data, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a description of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if not in the protocol
27 28 29 30 31		18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from intervention protocols
32 33 34 35 36	Data management	19	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, double data entry; range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data management procedures can be found, if not in the protocol
37 38 39 40	Statistical methods	20a	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes. Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the protocol
41 42 43		20b	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted analyses)
44 45 46 47 48		20c	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple imputation)
49	Methods: Monitoring		
50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	Data monitoring	21a	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of whether it is independent from the sponsor and competing interests; and reference to where further details about its charter can be found, if not in the protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is not needed
60	For pee	r review	/ only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 3

	21b	Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim results and make the final decision to terminate the trial
Harms	22	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial conduct
Auditing	23	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent from investigators and the sponsor
Ethics and dissen	ninatio	n
Research ethics /	24	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval
Protocol amendments	25	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)
Consent or assent	26a	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)
	26b	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable
Confidentiality	27	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial
Declaration of interests	28	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site
Access to data	29	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators
Ancillary and post-trial care	30	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation
Dissemination policy	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions
	31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers
	31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant- level dataset, and statistical code

Appendices		
Informed consent materials	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates
Biological specimens	33	Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in the current trial and for future use in ancillary studies, if applicable

\*It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the SPIRIT 2013 Explanation & Elaboration for important clarification on the items. Amendments to the protocol should be tracked and dated. The SPIRIT checklist is copyrighted by the SPIRIT Group under the Creative Commons "Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported" license. or beer territor on the

**BMJ** Open

# **BMJ Open**

# Protocol for a randomized trial evaluating the effect of applying gamification to simulation-based endoscopy training

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-024134.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	02-Jan-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Scaffidi, Michael; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Khan, Rishad; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Walsh, Catharine; Hospital for Sick Children, Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition, Learning Institute, and Research Institute; University of Toronto, The Wilson Centre Pearl, Matthew; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Winger, Kathleen; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Kalaichandran, Ruben; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Lin, Peter; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology Grover, Samir; St. Michael's Hospital, Division of Gastroenterology
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Medical education and training
Secondary Subject Heading:	Gastroenterology and hepatology
Keywords:	Endoscopy < GASTROENTEROLOGY, MEDICAL EDUCATION & TRAINING, Simulation

#### SCHOLARONE<sup>™</sup> Manuscripts

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
20 21	
27	
32	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
50	

Protocol for a randomized trial evaluating the effect of applying gamification to simulationbased endoscopy training

Michael A. Scaffidi<sup>1</sup>; Rishad Khan<sup>1</sup>; Catharine M. Walsh<sup>3,4</sup>; Matthew Pearl<sup>1</sup>; Kathleen Winger<sup>1</sup>; Ruben Kalaichandran<sup>1</sup>; Peter Lin<sup>1</sup>, Samir C. Grover<sup>1</sup>

Division of Gastroenterology, St. Michael's Hospital<sup>1</sup> Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology, and Nutrition, Learning Institute, and Research Institute, Hospital for Sick Children<sup>3</sup> The Wilson Centre, University of Toronto<sup>4</sup>

#### **Author Contributions**

Study conception and design: Scaffidi, Pearl, Walsh, Kalaichandran, Lin, Grover Data acquisition: Scaffidi, Khan, Walsh, Winger, Kalaichandran, Lin, Grover Analysis and interpretation of data: Scaffidi, Khan, Walsh, Grover Drafting of the manuscript: Scaffidi, Khan, Walsh, Grover, Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Scaffidi, Khan, Walsh, Pearl, Winger, Kalaichandran, Lin, Grover Final manuscript approval: Scaffidi, Khan, Walsh, Pearl, Winger, Kalaichandran, Lin, Grover

Trial Registration: Clinicaltrial.gov NCT03176251.

**Funding Agencies**: This work was supported by the Canadian Association of Gastroenterology and the AbbVie Centre of Excellence in Continuing Health Education [grant number: 2017CAG-ABBVIE-ERG].

Declarations: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Corresponding Author: Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC Division of Gastroenterology St. Michael's Hospital 16-036 Cardinal Carter Wing 30 Bond Street Toronto, Ontario M5B 1W8 Phone: (416) 864-5628 E-mail: grovers@smh.ca

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

#### Abstract

**Background:** Simulation-based training provides a safe environment and effective means to enhance skills development. Simulation-based curricula have been developed for a number of procedures, including gastrointestinal endoscopy. Gamification, which is the application of game-design principles to non-game contexts, is an instructional strategy with potential to enhance learning. No studies that have investigated the effects of a comprehensive gamification curriculum on the acquisition of endoscopic skills among novice endoscopists.

**Methods and analysis:** Thirty-six novice endoscopists will be randomized to one of two endoscopy simulation-based training curricula: (1) the Conventional Curriculum Group, in which participants will receive 6 hours of one-on-one simulation training augmented with expert feedback and interlaced with 4 hours of small group teaching on the theory of colonoscopy; or (2) the Gamified Curriculum Group, in which participants will receive the same curriculum with integration of the following game-design elements: a leaderboard summarizing participant performance, game narrative, achievement badges, and rewards for top performance. In line with a progressive learning approach, simulation training for participants will progress from low to high complexity simulators, starting with a bench top model and then moving to the EndoVR® virtual reality simulator. Performance will be assessed at three points: pre-training, immediately post-training and 4-6 weeks after training. Assessments will take place on the simulator at all three time points and transfer of skills will be assessed during two clinical colonoscopies 4-6 weeks post-training. Mixed factorial ANOVAs will be used to determine if there is a performance difference between the two groups during simulated and clinical assessments.

**Ethics and dissemination:** Ethical approval was obtained at St. Michael's Hospital. Results of this trial will be submitted for presentation at academic meetings and for publication in a peer-reviewed journal.

#### Strengths and limitations of this study

- The intervention in this randomized trial is a comprehensive gamified simulationbased curriculum in gastrointestinal endoscopy that includes a game narrative, performance tracking measures, and rewards. These game-design elements are grounded in educational theory.
- The primary outcome is clinical performance of live colonoscopies on real patients, which will be assessed by two blinded independent expert endoscopists using an assessment tool with strong validity evidence.
- Participants will be assessed immediately after training for skill acquisition, and 4-6 weeks after training to evaluate skill retention and transfer of skills to the clinical environment.
- There are significant human resources required for implementation with respect to tracking participants' game metrics and adjusting leaderboards.

Key Words: simulation; colonoscopy; gamification; skill acquisition

#### Introduction

Simulation-based training (SBT) provides a safe and effective means to enhance skills development in gastrointestinal endoscopy.<sup>1,2</sup> SBT is more effective when embedded within a curriculum that is grounded in educational theory.<sup>3–6</sup> While previous studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of comprehensive structured curricula and curricula based on a progressive learning approach<sup>4,7</sup>, other instructional strategies may further enhance procedural skills training.

One such enhancement may lie in gamification. Gamification refers to the application of game design elements, (conceptual building blocks central to creating successful games) to traditionally non-game contexts.<sup>8–10</sup> The overall purpose of gamification is to "encourage behavioral change and promote desired attitudes."<sup>11</sup> Gamification has previously been applied in health-related settings such as health promotion and e-health.<sup>12–14</sup> More recently, it has been gaining traction in the medical education setting, as gamification has the potential to improve learning and learner attention, engagement, motivation and behaviour change.<sup>8,15</sup> In a recent randomized trial, participants were ranked on a leaderboard as they completed cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR) training.<sup>16</sup> After training, participants who were ranked on a leaderboard had significantly better technical skills acquisition on the CPR training device. Another recent trial evaluated the effect of competition on novices' ability to learn simulated laparoscopic cholecystectomy.<sup>17</sup> The authors found that participants who engaged in competition demonstrated fewer movements and a shorter path length, suggesting increased efficiency.

While these reports highlight the potential benefits of gamification in educational contexts, the use of leaderboards and competition represent narrow applications of gamification. To date, there are no studies that have investigated the application of a comprehensive gamified curriculum that integrates multiple game design elements for procedural learning in medicine. Additionally, no studies have reported clinical outcomes on real patients. To bridge these gaps, we aim to determine the impact of a gamified simulation-based curriculum in endoscopy on clinical performance, compared to an identical curriculum that does not incorporate game design elements.

#### Methods & Analysis

#### Study Design

This single-blinded, parallel group, randomized controlled trial (RCT) is currently being conducted at St. Michael's Hospital in Toronto, Canada. Recruitment started June 2017. The methodology was adapted from previous studies by our group.<sup>3,4,18</sup> We used the SPIRIT checklist when writing our report.<sup>19</sup> The study design is summarized below in **Figure 1**.

#### Participants

Thirty-six novice endoscopists (performed < 25 previous real and/or simulated colonoscopies) will be recruited by one author (MAS). Participants will be included if they are from the general surgery or gastroenterology residency programs at the University of Toronto. Participants will be excluded if they have performed greater than 25 previous real and/or simulated colonoscopies.

#### Simulators

#### Bench Top Simulator

The bench top colonoscopy simulator is comprised of a series of vertical wooden barriers with numbered holes conforming to 27 different sequences of varying complexity. Participants use a real videocolonoscope, which provides visual output, to navigate through each sequence. This bench top endoscopy simulator helps develop general endoscopic skills and has shown good validity evidence for training novices.<sup>20</sup>

#### Virtual Reality Simulator

The EndoVR® virtual reality (VR) endoscopy simulator (CAE Healthcare, Montreal) is used for the VR training and all simulator tests. It models navigation through a colon, using a specialized endoscope that is inserted into a computer-based module with a screen showing

the colonic lumen of a virtual patient. It provides visual and haptic feedback related to the procedure. The simulator has several standardized case-based scenarios of varying complexity for colonoscopy and has robust validity evidence in the context of novices.<sup>21,22</sup>

#### **Experimental Design**

#### (1) Baseline questionnaires

Participants will complete a questionnaire to collect baseline demographic information, including age, sex, level of training, and previous endoscopic experience. Questions regarding experience with team sports and video games will also be included, as these may correlate with baseline endoscopic skil<sup>23</sup> (**Appendix 1**). Additionally, scales assessing the following variables will be administered: (1) competitiveness (Revised Competitiveness Index, **Appendix 2**); (2) self-efficacy (adapted General Self-Efficacy Scale, **Appendix 3**); and (3) game-type personality (Gamified User Personality Hexad, **Appendix 4**). All the included scales have good validity evidence.<sup>24–26</sup>

#### (2) Pre-test

Participants will complete a series of assessments prior to training to assess (1) their baseline knowledge of colonoscopy (knowledge test); (2) technical skills (VR simulation test); and (3) non-technical skills (VR simulation "integrated scenario" test). No feedback will be provided at any point during these assessments.

- 1. *Knowledge Test:* A 30-minute, 17 item multiple choice question (MCQ) test designed to assess core concepts related to colonoscopy, including indications, pathology, and theory underpinning non-technical skills (**Appendix 5**).
- 2. VR Simulation Test: A colonoscopy procedure on the VR simulator with a time limit of 30 minutes. Baseline technical proficiency will be assessed by an expert endoscopist. The procedure will be video-recorded, with identifying features hidden, to allow for a blinded assessment at a later time.<sup>27</sup>
- 3. *VR Simulation "Integrated Scenario" Test:* A test in which participants will complete a colonoscopy procedure on the VR simulator in a naturalistic setting (i.e., endoscopy suite) while interacting with a standardized nurse and standardized patient.<sup>28</sup> Trainees will be expected to take a brief patient history and obtain informed consent. The trainee will then carry out the procedure (EndoVR® Module 3 Polypectomy) as described above while responding to the patient and interacting with the nurse as appropriate. As in the technical test, performance will be assessed in real time and videotaped, ensuring anonymity is preserved.

#### (3) Training intervention

Following the pre-tests, participants will be randomized to one of two training groups, following a 1:1 allocation distribution

with no stratification. One author (RK) used an online sequence generator (<u>https://www.random.org/sequences/</u>) to generate a random sequence of numbers and placed labels with these numbers into sealed envelopes. Another author (MP), not involved in sequence generation, distributed the sealed envelopes to participants as they arrived for the course. The first author (RK) was not present during envelope distribution. Investigators were blinded to group allocation.

1. Conventional Curriculum (controls): The control group will receive a total of four, one-hour, small-group teaching sessions covering the theory of colonoscopy, including pathology, anatomy, and therapeutic technique. One session is dedicated to non-technical skills relevant to endoscopy (situation awareness, decision making, communication, teamwork, and leadership) and how they relate to clinical performance. In this session, participants will watch a video demonstrating ideal endoscopic non-technical skills and learn about the Endoscopic Non-Technical Skills (E-NTS) checklist which will be provided for them to use during the integrated scenario training (Appendix 6). This checklist was developed in accordance with evidence-based recommendations, and outlines key endoscopic non-technical skills.<sup>29</sup> Following each teaching session, a short MCQ test on the topics covered in that session will be administered, in keeping with the "test-enhanced learning" literature.<sup>30</sup> In addition to teaching sessions, the control group will be given a total of six hours of expertassisted instruction on both the bench top simulator (1 hour) and the VR simulator (5 hours).

Six modules of increasing difficulty in colonoscopy will be taught with one-on-one feedback from an expert academic endoscopist. The instructor will demonstrate techniques, answer questions and provide individualized performance feedback with a focus on non-technical skills. The last two hours of training on the VR simulator will consist of integrated scenarios, which feature a standardized patient and nurse. Following each scenario, the instructor will debrief the trainee on their performance, using the "E-NTS Checklist" as a framework for discussing their non-technical skills.

2. Gamified Curriculum (GC): This group will receive the same 4 hours of small group teaching and 6-hours of hands-on simulator training. Within the context of the teaching sessions and simulator training, the gamified curriculum will incorporate the following game design elements: a game narrative; performance tracking measures; and rewards. First, a game narrative will underlie the delivery of the gamified curriculum. Participants will be assigned an avatar and will be tasked with completing a journey of the avatar around a game-board shaped like the colon (Appendix 7) with the goal of reaching the final destination, the terminal ileum. Second, performance tracking measures will be used to allow participants to gauge their performance over time. These measures will be summarized on a leaderboard, which will include 4 components: a non-technical skills score; a technical skills score; a cognitive skills score; and an overall ranking, which will be determined through an algorithm that accounts for non-technical, technical and cognitive scores. Scoring of the non-technical and technical skills will be based on assessed performances during practice sessions on the VR simulator using the Modified Objective Structured Assessment of Non-Technical Skills (MOSANTS) (Appendix 8) and the Joint Advisory Group for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy's Direct Observation of Procedural Skills (JAG DOPS) tool (Appendix 9), respectively. Scoring of cognitive skills will be based on MCQ test scores from the teaching sessions. Scores will be aggregated on the leaderboard for participants training on the same days. The leaderboard will be presented to participants after they finish each hour of practice. Finally, participants will engage in a system of both short-term and long-term rewards. One short-term reward will involve badges to recognize achievements of procedural benchmarks (e.g. cecal intubation) (Appendix 10). Another short-term reward will be the assignment of a wearable medallion, which will be given to the participant with the highest overall ranking at the end of each hour of practice. The long-term reward will be a low-cost prize (i.e. less than \$25 CAD) given to the participant with the highest overall ranking throughout practice. All three game design elements (game narrative, performance tracking measures, reward system) will be introduced to participants in the gamified curriculum group prior to training with a brief tutorial video. After watching the video, participants will receive an anonymized ID to allow for self-tracking on the leaderboard while keeping individual scores private.

All three game design elements are consistent with recommendations from the gamification and educational literature. In line with self-determination theory, leaderboards are purported to increase users' sense of relatedness, engagement and competence through social comparison, feedback provision and documentation of achievement.<sup>31</sup> The rationale for achievement badges and other rewards is that they serve as visual symbol of attained goals, thus supporting participants' sense of competence and serving to foster external motivation and engagement<sup>31,32</sup>. Finally, game narratives are thought to enhance engagement through the integration of meaning and interaction.<sup>9</sup> These elements must be carefully calibrated to challenge and engage learners appropriately and to ensure maintenance of learners' intrinsic motivation.<sup>8,15</sup>

#### (4) Post-test

1 2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 50

51

52

53

54

55 56

57

58

59

60

Participants will complete a series of assessments immediately after training (immediate posttest). These will assess: (1) knowledge acquisition; (2) technical skills acquisition; and (3) non-technical skills acquisition. They will include the same *Knowledge Test*, *VR Simulation Test*, and *VR Simulation "Integrated Scenario" Test* that participants will complete during the *Pre-test*.

#### (5) Delayed testing (Retention and Transfer)

Participants will complete a series of assessments 4 to 6 weeks after training to assess their retention and transfer of skills. These will assess the following: (1) knowledge retention; (2) technical skills retention; (3) non-technical skills retention; and (4) transfer of skills to the

clinical environment. They will include the same *Knowledge Test*, *VR Simulation Test*, and *VR Simulation "Integrated Scenario" Test* that participants will complete during the *Pre-test* and the *Post-test*. To assess for transfer of skills to the clinical environment, participants will also complete two live colonoscopies on real patients. These two procedures occurred simultaneously on a single day between 4 and 6 weeks after completion of training .These procedures will be videotaped in a manner that anonymizes the identity of the participant and the patient. Procedures on patients with a history of colonic or pelvic surgery or difficult colonoscopy will be excluded. Sedation and monitoring will be carried out according to standard practices on the endoscopy unit. An experienced attending endoscopist (completed > 500 previous colonoscopies) will provide verbal and/or hands-on assistance as necessary and take over if the participant cannot complete the procedure, or if any concerns regarding patient safety ariose. All patients were consented for the use of their procedure in this study.

#### **Patient and Public Involvement**

We based our approach to patient involvement on previously published studies focusing on clinical outcomes for endoscopic training<sup>3,4</sup>, Specifically, patient involvement will be limited to their participation in the primary outcome, which involves assessment of clinical colonoscopies by study participants. Patients will not be required to evaluate the impact of the intervention. There will be no public involvement.

#### Primary outcome measure

The primary outcome measure is clinical performance during two live colonoscopies 4 to 6 weeks after training, as assessed by the JAG DOPS.<sup>33</sup>. Each clinical colonoscopy will be independently assessed by two experienced endoscopists who will be blinded to group assignment. One rater will be present during the procedure and the other rater will assess the participant's performance using the video-recorded procedure. Video-based assessment of endoscopic performances has been shown to have good validity evidence, compared to live assessment.<sup>27</sup>

#### Secondary outcome measures

- 1. Knowledge acquisition, as assessed by the MCQ Knowledge Tests
- 2. Technical skills acquisition during the VR Simulation Tests, as assessed by the JAG DOPS (Appendix 9)
- 3. Non-technical skills acquisition during the Integrated Scenario Test, as assessed by the Modified Objective Structured Assessment of Non-Technical Skills (M-OSANTS) for colonoscopy, which has good validity evidence for surgery and was modified for endoscopy<sup>5</sup> (Appendix 8)
- Patient comfort during the clinical colonoscopies, as assessed by the endoscopy nurses using the Nurse-Assessed Patient Comfort Score (NAPCOMS)<sup>34</sup> (Appendix 11)

#### Exploratory outcome measures

- Participant self-efficacy after each simulated and clinical colonoscopy testing procedure, as measured by an adapted General Self-Efficacy Scale<sup>25</sup> (Appendix 3)
- Cognitive load after each simulated and clinical colonoscopy testing procedure, as measured by the Cognitive Load Scale for Colonoscopy<sup>35</sup> (Appendix 12)
- Participant competitiveness after each simulated and clinical colonoscopy testing procedure, measured using the Revised Competitiveness Index<sup>24</sup> (Appendix 2).

Experienced endoscopists will assess participants' technical skills and non-technical skills during the pre-training, immediate and delayed post-training simulation-based assessments.

#### **Data Management**

Data will be collected through paper forms directly from assessors. Data from the forms will be extracted and input into a database on a password-protected computer. There is no requirement for a data monitoring committee as this is not a trial addressing the efficacy of a treatment nor is patient safety at risk. Details with respect to protection of confidentiality of participant data is outlined in the participant and patient consent forms (**Appendix 13**,
# Appendix 14).

### **Analysis Plan**

Statistical analyses will be performed using SPSS version 20 (SPSS, Inc, Chicago, IL). Alpha for all statistical tests will be set at 0.05. For all primary and sub-group analysis, appropriate measures will be taken to minimize an inflated Type I error due to multiple comparisons.

**Baseline Questionnaire:** Participant baseline variables will be characterized with descriptive statistics, using mean with standard deviation for continuous variables and number frequency for categorical variables, respectively.

**Clinical Performance:** Performance during the live colonoscopies will be compared between the two groups using the JAG DOPS, NAPCOMS, and MOSANTS scores. A mixed factor 2 (Gamified vs. Conventional Curriculum) x 2 (procedure 1 vs. procedure 2) analysis of variance (ANOVA) will be used. ANOVA differences significant at P < 0.05 will be further analyzed using Tukey honestly significant difference (HSD) post hoc tests. In addition, sensitivity analyses of the mixed factor ANOVA will be performed with gender and residency program (i.e. gastroenterology, general surgery) as covariates, as previous literature has identified gender differences in the acquisition of surgical skills<sup>36</sup>.

**Technical Performance**: Differences in technical skills acquisition on the simulator will be determined by comparing JAG DOPS scores between groups. Specifically, a mixed factor 2 (Gamified vs. Conventional Curriculum) x 3 (pre-test, post-test, retention test) ANOVA with Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests will be conducted.

*Non-Technical Skill Performance:* Differences in non-technical skills acquisition on the simulator will be determined by comparing MOSANTS scores. A mixed factor 2 (Gamified vs. Conventional Curriculum) x 3 (pre-test, post-test, retention test) ANOVA with Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests will be conducted.

**Competitiveness:** Baseline competitiveness, as measured by the Revised Competitiveness Index and the Gamification User Types Hexad, will be compared between groups using an independent t-test for each index.

**Self-efficacy:** Differences in self-efficacy between groups will be determined by comparing General Self-Efficacy Scale scores. A mixed factor 2 (Gamified vs. Conventional Curriculum) x 2 (pre-course vs. post- course) ANOVA with Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests will be conducted.

**Cognitive Load:** Differences in cognitive load between groups will be determined by comparing Cognitive Load Index of Colonoscopy scores. A mixed factor 2 (Gamified vs. Conventional Curriculum) x 2 (pre-course vs. post- course) ANOVA with Tukey's HSD post-hoc tests will be conducted.

# Sample size estimation

Since there are no prior studies investigating a gamified curriculum for procedural learning, we conducted the power analysis based on the effect size from a previous study that evaluated an SBT curriculum for endoscopy.<sup>3</sup> Based on an effect size of 1.0 (Cohen's d), an alpha of 0.05 (two-tailed), a beta of 0.10, 2 groups, and 2 measurements, a minimum of 17 participants will be required to achieve a power of greater than 0.90 using repeated measures ANOVA (between-factors). To accommodate for a potential 5% dropout and/or non-response, we will recruit a total of 36 participants.

# **Ethics and Dissemination**

Research ethics approval was granted by the St. Michael's Hospital Research Ethics Board (17-092). Protocol version 1.0, dated March 23, 2017, was approved. If any protocol modifications are needed, they will be made after communication with the research ethics board and will be detailed in any subsequent publications. Informed consent will be obtained from endoscopist participants and patients on whom participants will perform colonoscopies by one author (MAS). No personal health data on patients will be collected. All authors will have access to trial data. We will disseminate the results of the study through peer-reviewed

publication in journals and at scientific meetings. We do not plan to make participant-level data publicly available. The trial is registered at clinicaltrials.gov NCT03176251

### Feasibility

To date, 21 participants have been recruited, randomized and have completed the study. Data collection is ongoing and is intended to reach completion by August 2018. Subsequent data analysis, manuscript writing and submission for publication are anticipated to reach completion by July 2019.

### Discussion

The use of SBT for procedural skills training is widespread. In the report commissioned by the Future of Medical Education in Canada Postgraduate Project, the authors conclude that "simulation... needs to be integrated more thoughtfully into postgraduate curricula."<sup>37</sup> We aim to respond to this call through the development of an SBT curriculum grounded in educational theory. The strengths of this study lie in its randomized design and incorporation of various game design elements into the curriculum. Additionally, the primary outcome is measured in the clinical setting by two blinded expert assessors using an assessment tool with strong validity evidence. Finally, participants will be assessed both immediately after training for skill acquisition, and 4-6 weeks after training to evaluate skill retention and skill transfer to the clinical environment. There are several limitations of this study. First, this methodology requires substantial human resources to track participants' game metrics and adjust the leaderboards accordingly. Second, participants who are wearing the medallion that signifies high-ranking performance are potentially identifiable as being in the intervention arm. We do not, however, anticipate that this will impact outcome measures because the medallion is not visible on the video-recordings of the procedures. Furthermore, it is not worn during live colonoscopies. Finally, participant frustration, which may impact performance, is not included as an outcome measure.

# Acknowledgements

We would like to thank David Rojas for his input regarding the implementation of gamification principles and Roger Chow for administrative assistance.

# REFERENCES

- 1. Walsh CM, Sherlock ME, Ling SC, Carnahan H. Virtual reality simulation training for health professions trainees in gastrointestinal endoscopy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2012;6(6):CD008237. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD008237.pub2.
- Singh S, Sedlack RE, Cook DA. Effects of Simulation-Based Training in Gastrointestinal Endoscopy: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2014;12(10):1611-1623.e4. doi:10.1016/j.cgh.2014.01.037.
- Grover SC, Garg A, Scaffidi MA, et al. Impact of a simulation training curriculum on technical and nontechnical skills in colonoscopy: a randomized trial. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2015;82(6):1072-1079. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2015.04.008.
- 4. Grover SC, Scaffidi MA, Khan R, et al. Progressive learning in endoscopy simulation training improves clinical performance: a blinded randomized trial. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2017;86(5):881-889. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2017.03.1529.
- 5. Dedy NJ, Bonrath EM, Ahmed N, Grantcharov TP. Structured Training to Improve Nontechnical Performance of Junior Surgical Residents in the Operating Room. *Ann Surg.* 2016;263(1):43-49. doi:10.1097/SLA.000000000001186.
- 6. Young OM, Parviainen K. Training obstetrics and gynecology residents to be effective communicators in the era of the 80-hour workweek: a pilot study. *BMC Res Notes*. 2014;7:455. doi:10.1186/1756-0500-7-455.
- 7. Walsh CM, Ling SC, Khanna N, et al. Gastrointestinal endoscopy competency assessment tool: Reliability and validity evidence. *Gastrointest Endosc*. 2015;81(6):1417-1424.e2. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2014.11.030.
- 8. Rutledge C, Walsh CM, Swinger N, et al. Gamification in action: Theoretical and practical considerations for medical educators. *Acad Med.* 2018:1. doi:10.1097/ACM.00000000002183.
- 9. Deterding S, Dixon D, Khaled R, Nacke L. From game design elements to gamefulness: defining gamification. In: *Proceedings of the 15th International Academic MindTrek Conference: Envisioning Future Media Environments*. ACM; 2011:9-15.
- 10. Yunyongying P. Gamification: Implications for Curricular Design. *J Grad Med Educ*. 2014;6(3):410-412. doi:10.4300/JGME-D-13-00406.1.
- 11. Almarshedi A, Wanick V, Wills GB, Ranchhod A. Gamification and Behaviour. In: Steiglitz S, Lattemann C, Robra-Bissantz S, Zarnekow R, Brockmann T, eds. *Using Game Elements in Serious Contexts*. Springer; 2017:19-30. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-45557-0.
- 12. Edwards EA, Lumsden J, Rivas C, et al. Gamification for health promotion: systematic review of behaviour change techniques in smartphone apps. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(10):e012447. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012447.
- 13. Johnson D, Deterding S, Kuhn KA, Staneva A, Stoyanov S, Hides L. Gamification for health and wellbeing: A systematic review of the literature. *Internet Interv.* 2016;6:89-106. doi:10.1016/j.invent.2016.10.002.
- 14. Sardi L, Idri A, Fernández-Alemán JL. A systematic review of gamification in e-Health. *J Biomed Inform*. 2017;71(May):31-48. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2017.05.011.
- 15. McCoy L, Lewis JH, Dalton D. Gamification and Multimedia for Medical Education: A Landscape Review. *J Am Osteopath Assoc*. 2016;116(1):22-34. doi:10.7556/jaoa.2016.003.
- 16. MacKinnon RJ, Stoeter R, Doherty C, et al. Self-motivated learning with gamification improves infant CPR performance, a randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Simul Technol Enhanc Learn*. 2015;1(3):71-76. doi:10.1136/bmjstel-2015-000061.
- 17. Hashimoto DA, Gomez ED, Beyer-Berjot L, et al. A Randomized Controlled Trial to Assess the Effects of Competition on the Development of Laparoscopic Surgical Skills. *J Surg Educ.* 2015;72(6):1077-1084. doi:10.1002/dev.21214.Developmental.
- Khan R, Scaffidi MA, Walsh CM, et al. Simulation-Based Training of Non-Technical Skills in Colonoscopy: Protocol for a Randomized Controlled Trial. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2017;6(8):e153. doi:10.2196/resprot.7690.
- 19. Chan W, Tetzlaff J, Altman D, et al. SPIRIT 2013 Statement: Defining Standard Protocol Items for Clinical Trials. *Ann Intern Med.* 2013;158(3):200-207. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-158-3-201302050-00583.
- 20. Walsh CM, Coopper MA, Rabeneck L, Carnahan H. Bench-top versus virtual reality

1		
2		
3		simulation training in Endoscopy: Expertise discrimination. CAME. 2008.
4	21.	Ekkelenkamp VE, Koch AD, de Man R a, Kuipers EJ, Man RA De, Kuipers EJ.
5 6		Training and competence assessment in GI endoscopy: a systematic review. <i>Gut.</i> 2015;0:1-9. doi:10.1136/gutinl-2014-307173
7	22	Triantafyllou K Lazaridis I D. Dimitriadis GD. Virtual reality simulators for
8		gastrointestinal endoscopy training. <i>World J Gastrointest Endosc</i> , 2014:6(1):6-12.
9		doi:10.4253/wige.v6.i1.6.
10	23.	Van Dongen KW, Verleisdonk EJMM, Schijven MP, Broeders IAMJ. Will the
11		Playstation generation become better endoscopic surgeons? Surg Endosc Other
12		Interv Tech. 2011;25(7):2275-2280. doi:10.1007/s00464-010-1548-2.
13	24.	Harris PB, Houston JM. A Reliability Analysis of the Revised Competitiveness Index.
14		Psychol Rep. 2010;106(3):870-874. doi:10.2466/pr0.106.3.870-874.
15	25.	Pena G, Altree M, Field J, et al. Surgeons' and trainees' perceived self-efficacy in
16		operating theatre non-technical skills. <i>Br J Surg</i> . 2015;102(6):708-715.
17		doi:10.1002/bjs.9787.
18	26.	Tondello GF, Wehbe RR, Diamond L, Busch M, Marczewski A, Nacke LE. The
19		Gamification User Types Hexad Scale. Proc 2016 Annu Symp Comput Interact Play - CHI Play '16. 2016:229-243. doi:10.1145/2967934.2968082.
20	27.	Scaffidi MA, Grover SC, Carnahan H, et al. A Prospective Comparison of Live and
21		Video-Based Assessments of Colonoscopy Performance. Gastrointest Endosc.
22		2017;87(3):688-694.e2. doi:10.1016/j.gie.2017.08.020.
25	28.	Kneebone R, Nestel D, Yadollahi F, et al. Assessing procedural skills in context:
24		exploring the feasibility of an Integrated Procedural Performance Instrument (IPPI).
25	00	<i>Med Educ</i> . 2006;40:1105-1114. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02612.x.
20	29.	Hales BM, Pronovost PJ. The checklist-a tool for error management and performance
27	20	Hourie W.L. Effects of test taking on totentian learning in technology education : A
20	30.	may new W. Energy of lest laking on leterilion learning in letrinology education. A meta analysis <i>Litechnol Educ</i> 2007;18(2):24,36
30	31	Huang B. Hew KF. Do points, badges and leaderboards increase learning and activity.
31	01.	A quasi-experiment on the effects of gamification 23rd Int Conf Comput Educ
32		2015:(December):275-280.
33	32.	Gnauk B, Dannecker L, Hahmann M. Leveraging gamification in demand dispatch
34		systems. Proc 2012 Jt EDBT/ICDT Work - EDBT-ICDT '12. 2012:103.
35		doi:10.1145/2320765.2320799.
36	33.	Barton JR, Corbett S, Vleuten CP Van Der, Bowel E. The validity and reliability of a
37		Direct Observation of Procedural Skills assessment tool : assessing colonoscopic
38		skills of senior endoscopists. <i>Gastrointest Endosc</i> . 2012;75(3):591-597.
39		doi:10.1016/j.gie.2011.09.053.
40	34.	Rostom A, Ross ED, Dube C, et al. Development and validation of a nurse-assessed
41		doi:10.1016/i.gio.2012.10.003
42	35	Sewell II Boscardin CK Young IO et al Measuring cognitive load during procedural
43	00.	skills training with colonoscopy as an exemplar <i>Med Educ</i> 2016;50(6):682-692
44		doi:10.1111/medu.12965.
45	36.	Ali A, Subhi Y, Ringsted C, Konge L. Gender differences in the acquisition of surgical
46		skills: a systematic review. Surg Endosc Other Interv Tech. 2015;29(11):3065-3073.
47		doi:10.1007/s00464-015-4092-2.
48	37.	LeBlanc VR, Bould MD, McNaughton N, Brydges R, Piquette D, Sharma B. Simulation
49		in Postgraduate Medical Education.; 2011.
50		
51		
5Z		
55		
54 55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		

# **FIGURES**

Figure 1: Study design.



Partie	sipant ID Number	:		
1) Se	<b>x:</b> □ Female	□ Male		
2) Ag	e:			A 1.1 1
3) Ha	ndedness:	Right		Ambidextrous
4) Ye	ar of graduation f	rom Medical	School:	
5) Pro	ogramme:	tavalanı		
		lerology		
		y specify:		
6)   6	vel of training:	,peeny	<del> </del>	
0) 20				
	$\square PGY 2$			
	□ PGY 3			
	DPGY 4			
	DPGY 5			
	Other (please s	specify:		
7) Do	you have previou	us experience	• in playing	video games? 🛛 Yes
	□ No			
lf y	yes, please specif	fy:		
	(a) How many h	nours do you p	ay on avera	ge per week?
	(b) What types of	of games do y	ou play?	Sports
	Role-playing		· ·	
				Real-time strategy DC
0) Da	way have provid		(please	e describe)
o) Du endo	scopy in the clini	us experience	an periorini ted	ing gastronnestinal
enuo	softing? - Vas		leu	
lf ves	setting: Difes			
ii yoo	(c) Number of r	previous upper	r endoscopie:	s in the <i>clinical</i> setting
	(attempted or	completed):	endeeeepie	
	(d) Number of p	revious upper	endoscopies	s in the <b>simulated</b> settir
	(attempted or	completed):		
	(e) Number of p	previous colon	oscopies in t	he <i>clinical</i> setting (atte
	or completed)		· .	
	(f) Number of p	revious colono	oscopies in th	ne <i>simulated</i> setting
	(attempted or	completed): _		
	(g) Number of p	revious sigmo	idoscopies in	n the <i>clinical</i> setting
	(attempted or	completed): _		
	(h) Number of p	revious sigmo	idoscopies in	n the simulated setting
	(attempted or	completed): _		
	(i) Number of c	other <i>clinical</i> (	GI endoscopy	y procedures (please sp

2	
	(j) Number of other <i>simulated</i> GI endoscopy procedures (please specify procedure):
}	
0	
2	
3 4	
5	
6 7	
8	
9 0	
1	
3	
4 5	
6	
7 8	
)	
) 	
2	
) 	
	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

SELFASSESSMENT RATING FORM - 2017 GI SIMULATION COURSE

# **Competitiveness Scale**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I like competition	1	2	3	4	5
I am a competitive individual	1	2	3	4	5
I enjoy competing against an	1	2	3	4	5
opponent					
I don't like competing against	1	2	3	4	5
others					
I get satisfaction from	1	2	3	4	5
competing with others					
I find competitive situations	1	2	3	4	5
unpleasant					
I dread competing against	1	2	3	4	5
others	Ő.				
I try to avoid competing with	1	2	3	4	5
others					
I often try to outperform	1	2	3	4	5
others		4.			
I try to avoid arguments	1	2	3	4	5
I will do almost anything to	1	2	3	4	5
avoid an argument					
I often remain quiet rather	1	2	3	4	5
than risk hurting another					
person					
I don't enjoy challenging	1	2	3	4	5
others even when I think they					
are wrong					
In general, I will go along with	1	2	3	4	5
the group rather than create					
conflict					

Please rate the following items based on a 4-rar	nk scale.
= Not at all true 2= Hardly true 3= Moderately true	4= Exactly tru
	RATING
I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	
If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.	
It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	
I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	
Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	
I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	
I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	
When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	
If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.	
I can usually handle whatever comes my way.	

# **Gamification User Types Hexad Personal Questionnaire**

	Strongly Agree	Agree	More or less agree	Undecided	More or less disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
It makes me happy if I am able to help others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like helping others to orient themselves in new situations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like sharing my knowledge	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The wellbeing of others is important to me	Re	2	3	4	5	6	7
	C						
Interacting with others is important to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like being part of a team	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is important to me to feel like I am part of a community	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I enjoy group activities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
				0			
It is important to me to follow my own path	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I often let my curiosity guide me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like to try new things	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Being independent is important to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I like defeating obstacles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is important to me to always	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

#### Page 19 of 67

#### BMJ Open

### SELFASSESSMENT RATING FORM - 2017 GI SIMULATION COURSE

19 of 67	BMJ Open							
	SELFASSES	SMENT RAT	ING FORM	1 - 2017 GI SII	MULATION	COURSE		
It is difficult for me to let go of a problem before I have found a	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
solution I like mastering difficult tasks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
I like to provoke	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
I like to question the status quo	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
I see myself as a rebel	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
I dislike following rules	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
I like competitions where a prize can be won	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Rewards are a great way to motivate me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
If the reward is sufficient I will put in effort	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Return of investment is important to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
For peer revi	ew only - http:	://bmjopen.br	nj.com/site/	about/guidelin	es.xhtml			



# **Endoscopy Knowledge Post-Test**

This is the knowledge test for the University of Toronto endoscopic simulation course. Please type in your "endo" number to begin the test. The test consists of 17 questions for a total of 20 points.

The knowledge questions are on the next two pages. You have 30 minutes to answer these questions.

These answers are confidential, and your responses and score are only for the purposes of our research studies. They will not be used as part of your residency training assessments, or as part of competency assessments.

#### \*Required

1. Please type in your "endo" number login to start \*

ie, "Endo10"

# Endoscopic Knowledge Test (page 1 of 2)

#### 2. Question 1 (1 point)

Name the endoscopic device depicted below. *Mark only one oval.* 

- 🔵 A. Endoloop
  - ) B. Endoscopic snare
  - C. Endoscopic biopsy forceps
  - D. Gold probe
  - ) E. Oval probe



# 3. Question 2 (1 point)

What type of sigmoid colon loop is most beneficial for entry into the descending colon? *Mark only one oval.* 

- A. Alpha-loop
- B. Reverse alpha-loop
- C. Gamma-loop
- ) D. N-loop
- E. Reverse-N loop

# 4. Question 3 (1 point)

Below is an endoscopic image of the larynx taken with a gastroscope. Which location is representative of the ideal place to position the gastroscope to intubate the esophagus? *Mark only one oval.* 

A	$\bigcirc$	
В	$\bigcirc$	
С	$\bigcirc$	
D	$\bigcirc$	



### 5. Question 4 (1 point)

Which of the images below is an endoscopic image of the cecum? *Mark only one oval.* 



For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



# 6. Question 5 (1 point)

The pit pattern of polyps is commonly used as an endoscopic classification to determine the likely histopathology. What is the name of the classification most commonly used for pit patterns? *Mark only one oval.* 



- A. Kudo classification
- B. Maclean classification
- C. Yoshida classification
- D. Haggitt classification
- E. Sarin classification

# 7. Question 6 (1 point)

The pit patterns of the polyp depicted below have been enhanced by use of ambient light of bluegreen wavelength (approximately 450 - 540 nm). What is the name of this technology? *Mark only one oval.* 

- A. Confocal microscopy
- B. Optical coherence tomography
- C. Chromoendoscopy
- D. FICE (Fuji intelligent chromoendoscopy)
- ) E. Narrow band imaging



### 8. Question 7 (1 point)

With a well prepared colonoscopy to the cecum performed by an experienced endoscopist, what is the approximate risk of missed advanced neoplasia? *Mark only one oval.* 



В.	3-5%	0

C. 5-10%

D. >10%

### 9. Question 8 (1 point)

Below is an endoscopic view of a patient's esophagus. What is the endoscopic diagnosis? *Mark only one oval.* 

- A. Eosinophilic esophagitis
  - B. Radiation esophagitis
  - C. Mosaic esophagus
  - ) D. Barrett's esophagus
- E. Diffuse-type squamous cell carcinoma

For peer review o



# Endoscopy knowledge test (page 2 of 2)

# 10. Question 9 (1 point)

Which of the following is a commonly used bowel preparation score for colonoscopy? *Mark only one oval.* 

- A. Los Angeles bowel preparation score
- ) B. Ottawa bowel preparation score
- C. King's College bowel preparation score
- ) D. Chicago bowel preparation score
- E. Washington bowel preparation score

# **Question 10 (4 points)**



# Identify the labelled parts of the colonoscope head (4 points; 0.5 points each)



18.	н
-	
Qu	estion 11 (1 point)
Cert the p endo	ain skills necessary for endoscopic performance may be independent of the technical performar procedure. Name four non-technical skills that you would view as important in the performance c oscopic procedures.
19.	Α
20.	В
21	C
22.	D
23	Question 12 (1 point)
20.	Which of the following is not a risk factor for colonic perforation at the time of colonoscopy Mark only one oval.
	A. Barotrauma
	B. Mucosal injection
	<ul><li>B. Mucosal injection</li><li>C. Sigmoid looping</li></ul>
	<ul> <li>B. Mucosal injection</li> <li>C. Sigmoid looping</li> <li>D. Trainee endoscopist performing colonoscopy</li> </ul>

# 24. Question 13 (1 point)

A 50 year old patient presents for a screening colonoscopy to your open access endoscopy unit. They have completed a 4L bowel preparation. Upon taking a history, you discover that they had a colonoscopy 2 years ago to work up anorectal bleeding but you don't have the results. What is the appropriate course of action? *Mark only one oval.* 

A. Complete a screening colonoscopy because the indication of colorectal cancer screening is different than anorectal bleeding.

B. Another screening colonoscopy is not needed; send patient home.

C. Make concerted effort to track down report of prior colonoscopy and if not obtained, then proceed with screening colonoscopy.

D. Make concerted effort to track down report of prior colonoscopy and if not obtained, then explain to patient that they can choose to defer procedure until report is obtained and reviewed

E. Your endoscopic skills exceed that of the previous endoscopist and the procedure must be repeated.

# 25. Question 14 (1 point)

A unilingual Azerbaijani woman comes in for a gastroscopy to work up epigastric pain. She is unable to understand the consent process, which of the following is most correct? *Mark only one oval.* 

- A. Do a physical examination; if she has abdominal discomfort, continue with gastroscopy.
- B. Ask the patient's daughter to translate the consent form.
- ) C. Reschedule the gastroscopy and ask her to bring a translator.
- D. Reschedule the gastroscopy and arrange for a translator to accompany her.
- E. Obtain consent from daughter and proceed with procedure

# 26. Question 15 (1 point)

You are completing a screening colonoscopy and discover a 12 mm pedunculated polyp in the transverse colon. The endoscopy nurse suggests the use of a 10 mm snare and no electrocautery, but you believe a 15 mm snare with electrocautery would be more appropriate. What do you do? *Mark only one oval.* 

A. Take the nurse's suggestion since he/she is more experienced than yourself.



C. Ask the nurse for the rationale for the smaller snare and the absence of cautery and verbalize your decision to proceed with the 15 mm snare with cautery.

D. Discuss with the nurse why you wish to proceed with the larger snare and electrocautery before proceeding with the polypectomy.

	E.	Call	in	6
(	<u> </u>	00		-

E. Call in a colleague to assist in the decision making.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

# Endoscopy Knowledge Post-Test

### 27. Question 16 (1 point)

You are completing a polypectomy of a 2 cm Paris II-a (flat) polyp in the cecum of a 65 year old male. After the polypectomy you notice a perforation in the cecum. You aim to close the defect with endoclips, start antibiotics, and arrange imaging and possible surgery. Which of the following would not be appropriate? *Mark only one oval.* 

- A. Start the plan above for the management of the patient's complication, as soon as possible.
  - B. Inform family members of the procedure's complications before proceeding with the above
  - C. Ensure airway, breathing and circulation are intact above all else.
  - D. Call for extra assistance into the room as soon as possible.
  - ) E. Stay calm as you manage the situation.

### 28. Question 17 (1 point)

plan.

You perform a screening colonoscopy on an anemic 50 year old male who complains of weight loss, altered bowel habits and blood in his stool. You identify the patient is suffering from colorectal cancer. Which one of the following would not be appropriate in explaining the results of the colonoscopy to the patient?

Mark only one oval.

- A. Ensure the results are delivered in a private setting
- B. Do not inform the patient of the suspected diagnosis until you have the pathology results
- C. Ensure to be empathetic during delivery of the results of the colonoscopy
- D. Establish that the patient understands the results after you explain it to them
- E. Be aware of the patient's reaction and tone as you are delivering the news

# TEAMSTEPPS TEAMWORK ATTITUDES QUESTIONNAIRE

With respect to how each question applies to interactions with a team in ENDOSCOPY, please respond to the questions below by placing a checkmark in the box that corresponds to your level of agreement from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. We realize that the questions may be a little vague but please select only one response for each question.

# **Team Structure**

# 29. 1. It is important to ask patients and their families for feedback regarding patient care before/in/after endoscopy \*

Mark only one oval.

Strong disagree

- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

30 2 Patients are a critical c	omnonent of the care team	n in surgery and endoscopy *
	omponent of the oute tour	i ni surgery una enaoscopy

Mark only one oval.

Disagree Neutral Agree

Strong disagree

Strongly agree

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	

60

31	1. 3. The Department of Surgery or Division of Gastroenterology influences the success of direct care teams in surgery and endoscopy *
	Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Disagree
	Neutral

Agree

Strongly agree

32. 4. In surgery and endoscopy, the mission of the team is of greater value that the goals of individual team members \*

Mark only one oval.

$\bigcirc$	Strong disagree
$\bigcirc$	Disagree
$\bigcirc$	Neutral
$\bigcirc$	Agree
$\bigcirc$	Strongly agree

33. 5. Effective team members can anticipate the needs of other team members \*

Mark only one oval.



- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

# 34. 6. High-performing teams in health care share common characteristics with high-performing teams in other industries \*

Mark only one oval.



Strongly agree

# Leadership

	ong disagree
	utral
Str	ongly agree
36. <b>8. Leader</b> s	s should create informal opportunities for team members to share information *
Mark only	one oval.
Str	ong disagree
	agree
O Ne	utral
Ag	ree
Str	ongly agree
37. <b>9. Effectiv</b>	/e leaders view honest mistakes as meaningful learning opportunities *
Mark only	one oval.
Str	ong disagree
	agree
O Ne	utral
Ag	ree
Str	rongly agree
8. <b>10. It is a</b>	leader's responsibility to model appropriate team behaviour *
Mark only	one oval.
Str	ong disagree
Dis	agree
O Ne	utral
$\square$	
Ag	ree

Strong disagree

Strongly agree

Strong disagree

Strongly agree

room for important situation cues. \*

Strong disagree

Strongly agree

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Mark only one oval.

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

Situation monitoring

Mark only one oval.

Disagree

Neutral

Agree

team \*

39	. 11. It is important for surgeon-leaders or endoscopy-leaders to take time to discuss their team
	members' plans for each patient *
	Mark only one oval.

40. 12. Team leaders should ensure that team members help each other out when necessary \*

41. 13. Individuals can be taught how to scan the patient environment in the OR or procedure

42. 14. Monitoring patients provides an important contribution to the effective performance of the

Mark	only one oval.
$\bigcirc$	Strong disagree
$\bigcirc$	Disagree
$\bigcirc$	Neutral
$\bigcirc$	Agree
$\bigcirc$	Strongly agree

f <sub>7</sub> 67	End Stopy Phone Post-Test
	43. 15. Even individuals who are not part of the direct care team should be encouraged to scan for
	and report changes in patient status *
	Disagree
	Neutral
	Agree
	Strongly agree
	44. 16. It is important to monitor the emotional and physical status of other team members *
	Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Disagree
	Neutral
	Agree
	Strongly agree
	45. 17. It is appropriate for one team member to offer assistance to another who may be too tired or stressed to perform a task *
	Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Disagree
	Neutral
	Agree
	Strongly agree
	46. 18. Team members who monitor their emotional and physical status on the job are more
	Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Neutral
	Agree
	Strongly agree
	Mutual support

17	Endoscopy Rnowledge Post-Test
	$47.$ 19. To be effective, team members should understand the work of their fellow team members. $^{\star}$
	Mark only one oval.
	Strong disagree
	Disagree
	Neutral

- Agree
- Strongly agree

#### 48. 20. Asking for assistance from a team member us a sign that that individual does not know how to do his/her job effectively \*

Mark only one oval.

- Strong disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree

### Strongly agree

#### 49. 21. Providing assistance to team members is a sign that an individual does not have enough work to do \*

Mark only one oval.

$\bigcirc$	Strong	disagree

- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

### 50. 22. Offering to help a fellow team member with his/her individual work tasks is an effective tool for improving team performance \*

Mark only one oval.

- Strong disagree
- Disagree
  - Neutral
  - Agree
- Strongly agree

Page 35 0f 67	Endoscopy Chewledge Post-Test
1	51. 23. It is appropriate to continue to assert a patient safety concern until you are certain that it has been heard. *
2	Mark only one oval.
3	Strong disagree
4	
6	
7	
8 9	
10	Strongly agree
11 12	
13	52. 24. Personal conflicts between team members do not affect patient safety ^
14	
15 16	Strong disagree
17	Disagree
18 10	Neutral
20	Agree
21	Strongly agree
22 23	
24	O a manufaction
25	Communication
26 27	
28	53. 25. Teams that do not communicate effectively significantly increase their risk of committing
29 30	Mark only one oval
31	
32	Strong disagree
33 34	Disagree
35	Neutral
36	Agree
37 38	Strongly agree
39	
40 41	54. 26. Poor communication is the most common cause of reported errors *
42	Mark only one oval.
43	Strong disagree
44 45	
46	Neutral
47 48	
49	
50	
51	
53	
54	
56	
57	
58 50	
60	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

	Endoscopy Knowledge Post-Test
55. <b>27. Ad</b>	verse events may be reduced by maintaining an information exchange with patients
their fa	amilies *
Mark o	inly one oval.
$\bigcirc$	Strong disagree
$\bigcirc$	Disagree
$\bigcirc$	Neutral
$\bigcirc$	Agree
$\bigcirc$	Strongly agree
56. <b>28. l p</b>	refer to work with team members who ask questions about information I provide *
Mark o	nly one oval.
$\bigcirc$	Strong disagree
$\bigcirc$	Disagree
$\bigcirc$	Neutral
$\overline{\bigcirc}$	Agree
$\bigcirc$	Strongly agree
57. <b>29. lt i</b> : nation	s important to have a standardized method for sharing information when handing off
patien	ts after endoscopy *
	ing one oval.
$\bigcirc$	Strong disagree
$\bigcirc$	Disagree
$\bigcirc$	Neutral
$\bigcirc$	Agree
$\bigcirc$	Strongly agree
58. <b>30. lt i</b>	s nearly impossible to train individuals how to be better communicators *
Mark o	nly one oval.
$\bigcirc$	Strong disagree
$\bigcirc$	Disagree
$\bigcirc$	Neutral
$\bigcirc$	Agree
$\bigcirc$	Strongly agree
59. Please space	e indicate any additional comments in the below.
	for your portionation
Thanka	TAR VAUR NARTICINATIAN
Thanks	for your participation.

### Page 37.0f-67

Powered by

BMJ Open

1 Endoscopist Participant ID #:	Date (DD/MM/YYYY):		Sta	art Time:	
2 3			Er	nd Time:	
<ul> <li><sup>4</sup></li> <li>5 Assessor: Self-Assessment</li> <li><sup>6</sup></li> <li>7 VR Case:</li> </ul>	VR Simulator (circle one):	1	2	3	

# ENDOSCOPIC NON-TECHNICAL SKILLS SELF-REFLECTION TOOL

Y / N

1. Did I take a focused patient history?	
2. Did I review the patient's medications (i.e. anticoagulants) and allergies?	
3. Did I identify the correct procedure and take an appropriate consent?	
4. Did I discuss the sedation plan with the anesthetist or RN?	
5. Did I introduce the team and myself to the patient?	
6. Did I discuss the procedure with the patient and address concerns?	
7. Did I ask the team if they were ready to start?	
8. Did I situate the patient in the correct position?	
9. Did I verbalize/acknowledge relevant anatomy/landmarks?	
10. Did I check vital signs often (every few minutes)?	
11. Did I update the team and patient on the progress of the procedure?	
12. Did I address patient comfort (i.e. ask the patient where pain is) and enact a plan for a patient who was not comfortable?	
13. Did a secondary goal arise during the procedure (e.g. polypectomy)? Did I identify issues and problems that arose from this scenario? Did I verbalize the plan to attend to these?	
14. Did I use closed-loop communication when interacting with the team?	
15. Did I discuss results with the patient post-procedure (i.e. complication, what was found, etc.) and create a follow-up plan?	
16. Was I respectful toward the patient and team?	
17. Did I identify any errors I made afterward? If so what can I do to improve my performance?	







# **M-OSANTS – NON-TECHNICAL SKILLS**

3 4	SITUATIONAL AWARENESS: sample guestions are listed below, give a global rating.						
5 6 7	1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent		
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Was the endoscopist able to remain aware of the patient's history (e.g. allergies, medications, etc.)? Did the endoscopist review procedural details prior to procedure (e.g. confirms correct procedure)? Did the endoscopist demonstrate procedural planning (e.g. identifies objectives for the procedure at the start)? Did the endoscopist collect and use information during the procedure (e.g. change in vital signs)? Did the endoscopist recognize the scope of practice (e.g. refrain from unfamiliar procedures/ interventions)? Did the endoscopist anticipate potential problems during the procedure while proposing suitable solutions (e.g. proactively apply loop reduction strategies)? Was the endoscopist mindful of procedure time? Did the endoscopist ensure that patient outcomes are met (e.g. maintain patient comfort)? Did the endoscopist anticipate needs of team members and of the patient (e.g. minimize patient anxiety)?						
19 20	DECISION MAKING: sa	ample questions ar	e listed below, giv	e a global rating.			
21 22	1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent		
24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33	appropriate to endoscopic appearance)? Did the endoscopist identify issues and subsequently tailor a plan for resolution (e.g. application of loop reduction strategies)? Did the endoscopist confidently create a plan and articulate details of the plan to the team)? Did the endoscopist demonstrate understanding of the risks and benefits of an intervention/ maneuver (e.g. aware of bleeding risk due to polypectomy)? Did the endoscopist account for relevant patient information (e.g. mindful of contraindications)? Did the endoscopist appropriately delegate tasks to staff (e.g. requesting equipment from nurses)? Did the endoscopist respond appropriately if the procedure extends out of the endoscopist's scope of practice (e.g. asking for assistance from senior staff)?						
34 35	COMMUNICATION: sample questions are listed below, give a global rating.						
36 37 38	1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent		
<ol> <li>39</li> <li>40</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>43</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> </ol>	Was the endoscopist able to receive and respond to information from team members? Did the endoscopist actively limit distractions in the room (e.g. restricts cell phone use)? Did the endoscopist convey information using a closed-loop (e.g. confirms amount of sedation to be administered)? Did the endoscopist speak with clarity, while providing details when appropriate (e.g. requesting snare with specific size)? Did the endoscopist indicate a specific team member if there are multiple staff (e.g. addresses nurse by name)? Did the endoscopist use language appropriate for the recipient (e.g. minimizes medical jargon for patients)? Was the endoscopist aware of verbal tone and volume (e.g. speaks to staff in a respectful, collegial manner that can be heard)? Did the endoscopist ensure that the recipient understands information (e.g. patient comprehends risks)? Did the endoscopist relay findings to patient, including any adverse events (e.g. follow-up during aftercare)?						
50 51	LEADERSHIP: sample questions are listed below, give a global rating.						
52 53	1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent		
55 56 57 58 59 60	Was the endoscopist able to take responsibility for the process of the procedure (e.g. acknowledge mistakes)? Did the endoscopist direct the flow of the team process, including an appropriate delegation of labour (e.g. requesting that nurses attend to patient discomfort)? Did the endoscopist demonstrate confidence when leading the team, even under pressure (e.g. maintains composure during a bleed)? Did the endoscopist lead thecendescopis/pause?http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml						

PROFESSIONALISM:	sample questions a	are listed below, g	ive a global rating.	
1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent
d the endoscopist demons mself/herself to everyone in d the endoscopist acknowl d the endoscopist display of d he endoscopist advocate d the endoscopist manage d the endoscopist ensure f dedicated clinical area)? d the endoscopist refrain f d the endoscopist ensure f	trate a respectful and contract of the room)? Iedge mistakes during prempathy for the patient ( or behalf of the patient ( or beh	purteous attitude toward rocedure? (e.g. responds to patier t? . mindful of endoscopy atient concerns within a ersations (e.g. does not res to best-practice gui	ds the patient and team nt discomfort)? unit time)? appropriate environment discuss other patients c delines (e.g. record qua	members (e.g. introduces (e.g. follow-up within offic luring a procedure)? lity metrics)?
EAMWORK: sample	questions are liste	d below, give a glo	obal rating.	
1 - Fail	2 - Poor	3 - Average	4 - Very good	5 - Excellent
a the endoscopist demons as the endoscopist aware id the endoscopist display id the endoscopist ask for a id the endoscopist take into	trate respect for all mem of the roles of all membe willingness to assist othe advice from other team r o account feedback from	nbers of the team (e.g. ers of the endoscopic to ers, if appropriate (e.g. members? n other team members (	speaks in a collegial, reseam? when transferring a pati (e.g. listens to suggestio	spectful tone)? ent)? ns for equipment)?

BMJ Open SPPRETEST – ASSESSOR RATING FORM - 2017 GI SIMULATION COURSE

Endos	copist	Participant ID #: [	Date (DD/MM/YYYY):		Star	t Tin	ne: _	
					Enc	l Tim	ne:	
Asses	sor:	\	/R Simulator (circle one):	1	2	3		
VR Ca	ase: Po	lypectomy Case 3						
Maxim	al dist	ance reached (check one): Rect	um H	epatic Fle	exure			
		Sign	noid A	scending	Colo	n		
		Desc	cending Colon C	ecum				
		Sple	nic Flexure T	erminal II	eum			
		<u>DOPS – T</u>	ECHNICAL SKILLS					
Pleas	e write	the appropriate score from the s	cale below					
Sc	ale:	4 Highly skilled performance						
		3 Competent & safe throughout	procedure, no uncorrected	errors				
		2 Some standards not yet met, a	spects to be improved, so	me errors	uncor	recte	ed	
		1 Accepted standards not yet me	et, frequent errors uncorrec					-
		CRITERIA			SC	ORE		4
A	ssess	ment, consent, communication						4
	o Obt	ains informed consent using a structure	d approach					
	0	Risk and complications explained				2		
	0	Co-morbidity			2	3	4	
	0	Sedation						
	0 Dor	Opportunity for questions	nd dianity during the proce	dure 1	2	3	Λ	-
		municates clearly with national includir	nd dignity during the proce	vith	<b>_</b>	5	-	-
	app	opriate management and follow up pla	n. Full endoscopy report.	1	2	3	4	
ę	Safety	and sedation						
•	Saf	and secure IV access (or indicates nee	d)	1	2	3	4	1
•	Giv	es appropriate dose of analgesia and se	edation and ensures adequ	Jate	2	3	4	7
	оху	genation and monitoring of patient (or in	dicates does, need for monitor	oring)	-	Ŭ	-	_
•	Der	nonstrates good communication with th	e nursing staff, including	1	2	3	4	
E	dos	ages and vital signs						
	Ch	Opic skills aka andaaaana funatian hafara intuhati	op (ar indicates read to share		<u> </u>	2	4	-
		orme/Indicates pand for DD	on (or indicates need to chec	ικ) 1	2	ა ი	4	-
		ums/multales need for PK	lination		2	<u>ა</u>	4	-
		italiis iuminai view / inserts in iuminal o		the	<b></b>	3	4	-
	Der	edure and takes appropriate action	ciousness and pain during	1	2	3	4	
0	D Use	s torque steering and control knobs and	propriately	1	2	3	4	-
	USF	s distension, suction and lens washing	appropriately	1	2	3	4	1
	Rec	ognizes and logically resolves loop for	nation	1	2	3	4	1
0	) Use	s position change and abdominal press	sure to aid luminal views	1	2	3	4	1
(	cor	pletes procedure in reasonable time			2	3	4	1
D	iaano	tic and therapeutic ability			_	-	-	1
	Ade	quate mucosal visualization		1	2	3	4	1
	Rec	ognizes caecal/desc. colon landmarks	or incomplete examination	1	2	3	4	1
	Acc	urate identification and management of	pathology	1	2	3	4	1
	Use	s diathermy and therapeutic techniques	s appropriately and safely	1	2	3	4	<b>N/</b>
		ognizes and rabilities leview handle attack and	nigaen lanzi com/site/about/gu	idelines.xht	ml 2	3	4	

2
3
1
-
5
6
7
8
0
9
10
11
12
13
1.0
14
15
16
17
10
10
19
20
21
22
~~ >>
23
24
25
26
20
27
28
29
30
31
21
32
33
34
35
26
30
37
38
39
10
41
41
42
43
44
Λ5
45
46
47
48
49
50
50
51
52
53
54
54
55
56
57
58
50
29
60

# Appendix X: Badge Table

Requirement Needed	Standardized Hints	Setting	Hour
Complete a case in less than a minute	Complete a case in less than a minute	Low fidelity	Hour 1
Complete Low Fidelity	Complete all Low fidelity cases	Low Fidelity	Hour 1
Proper Torque (as determined by assessor)	Torque properly	Low Fidelity	Hour 1
Less than 10% time in red- out	Be careful how much time in red out you spend.	Intro 3/4	Hour 2
Less than 90% Air left in colon	Remove an appropriate amount of air from the colon	Intro 3/4	Hour 2
Over 90% visualization	Make sure to have enough visualize the colon	Intro ¾	Hour 2
Identify the Ulcerative Colitis	ID a diagnosis	Intro 5	Hour 3
Identify pseudomembranous colitis	ID a diagnosis	Biopsy 3	Hour 3
Successful biopsy of Crohn's patient	Use the biopsy forceps	Poly 4	Hour 3 or 4
Take a Photo of a Pedunculated Polyp	Take photos	Poly 1	Hour 4
Identification of location of Polyp (splenic flexure or _cm in)	Say what you see	Poly 3	Hour 4
Outline major risks in colonoscopy	Pros and Cons	Integrated Scenarios	Hour 5/6
Minimum of 4/5 1. Infection 2. Perforation 3. Missed lesions 4. Sedation complications 5. Bleeding			
Pain acknowledgement (administration of meds, empathetic statement)	"Pain"	Integrated Scenarios	Hour 5/6
No time in extreme Pain	Patient comfort is important	Integrated Scenarios	Hour 5/6
--	--	----------------------	----------
Do an endoscopic Pause 1. Indicate a pause 2. Revise case 3. Feedback from SN	"Pause"	Integrated Scenarios	Hour 5/6
Retroflex without assistance	"Rectum"	High Fidelity	Any
Intubate the TI	Make sure you finish the whole pathway	High Fidelity	Any

\*Assessors please fill out

### NURSE ASSESSED PATIENT COMFORT SCORE (NAPCOMS)

Domain	Item	0	1	2	3	Score
	1- Intensity	None or minimal	Mild	Moderate	Severe	
Pain	2- Frequency	None	Few (1 or 2 episodes)	Several times (3-4 episodes)	Frequent (>4 episodes)	
	3- Duration	None	Short duration (episode <30 seconds)	Moderate duration (30 sec-1 minute)	Long duration (episode lasts >1 min)	
	Total	Pain Score (I	ntensity + Frequ	uency + Durat	ion)	
Sedation	Level of consciousness* Alert		Sleepy but initiates conversation	Responds only when asked or stimulated	Unresponsive or only responds with pronounced simulation	
Global	Tolerability*	olerability* Very well tolerated		Just tolerated	Poorly tolerated	

\*Note: level of consciousness and tolerability are not used in overall score

COGNITIVE LOAD INDEX RATING FORM - 2017 GI SIMULATION COURSE

#### Cognitive Load Index for Colonoscopy

CRITERIA	SCORE
<b>Intrinsic load items:</b> Please rate your agreement with the following statements regarding the colonoscopy you've just completed. Please circle from 0 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree)	
1. Physically manipulating and controlling the colonoscope was difficult	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2. Using ancillary instruments (i.e. biopsy forceps, polypectomy snare) was difficult	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3. Identifying normal anatomy and/or landmarks was difficult	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4. The endoscopic findings were complex or difficult to characterize	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
5. It was difficult to manage identified pathology (i.e. polyps that were difficult to remove, bleeding that was difficult to control)	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
6. It was difficult to keep track of, or remember, all the endoscopic findings	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
7. Managing the patient's level of comfort was difficult	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
8. Overall, this colonoscopy was difficult and/or complex	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
<b>Extraneous load items:</b> Please rate your agreement with the following statements regarding your experience during the colonoscopy you've just completed. Please circle from 0 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree)	
1. My supervisor's instructions were unclear	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2. My supervisor used language that was confusing or unfamiliar	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3. The manner in which my superior provided instructions	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4. I felt distracted by other people present in the endoscopy room	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
5. I felt distracted by the environment (i.e. my pager going off, environmental noise)	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
6. I felt distracted by things on my mind unrelated to this colonoscopy	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
<b>Germane load items:</b> Please rate your agreement with the following statements regarding your level of mental effort during the colonoscopy you've just completed. Please circle from 0 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree)	
1. I invested substantial mental effort learning how to control or manipulate the colonoscope and/or other endoscopic equipment	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2. I invested substantial mental effort identifying or understanding colonic anatomy	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3. I invested substantial mental effort understanding, remembering and/or managing the endoscopic findings	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4. I invested substantial mental effort learning how to manage patient comfort level	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
5. Overall, I invested substantial mental effort learning during this colonoscopy	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

# St. Michael's

## Inspired Care. Inspiring Science.

Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy: impact on clinical performance

## **CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY**

This is a consent form regarding the above mentioned research study. Before you give your consent to voluntarily participate in this study, it is important that you read the following information and ask the study personnel as many questions as necessary to be sure you understand what you will be asked to do.

#### **Investigators**

Principal Investigator:

Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC Division of Gastroenterology St. Michael's Hospital 16-036 Cardinal Carter Wing 30 Bond Street Toronto, Ontario M5B 1W8 Phone: (416) 864-5628 Fax: (416) 864-5882 E-mail: grovers@smh.ca

Consent Form, Version Date: September 5, 2017 Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy: impact on clinical performance For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xntml

#### **Background and Purpose of the Study**

Colonoscopies are medical procedures that gastroenterology physicians and general surgeons learn during their residency training. Traditionally, these procedures are learned for the first time on patients in the clinical setting under the supervision of a fully-trained attending physician. Virtual reality (VR) has since been used to create devices, called endoscopic simulators that can emulate the look and feel of performing colonoscopies, and have been validated in research studies to confer basic skills to trainees. The optimal method to use virtual reality simulators for teaching trainees that have yet to begin procedures in colonoscopy has yet to be determined, and was identified by the American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy as a need for further training.

The primary objective of this project is to evaluate the impact of a simulation-based training curriculum using gamification on clinical performance in colonoscopy.

## <u>Eligibility</u>

You are asked to consider taking part in this study if you are a resident in General Surgery, Adult Gastroenterology or Pediatric Gastroenterology at the University of Toronto.

In order to be eligible for this study, you must be a post-graduate trainee in the above programs, must have completed less than 25 colonoscopic procedures, and must have completed less than 25 simulated colonoscopy procedures to date.

#### **Description of the Study**

We aim to recruit 36 postgraduate novice endoscopists from the Adult Gastroenterology, Pediatric Gastroenterology and General Surgery training programs at the University of Toronto. **Note:** this study takes place concurrently alongside the Annual Endoscopic Simulation Training Course. The study, as described below, is a randomized control trial that is investigating the effectiveness of a new simulation-based curriculum. The Annual Endoscopic Simulation Training Course is an educational program through the University of Toronto, which aims to teach novices how to perform colonoscopies. Participation in the study component is optional; if you chose to opt-out of the study, it <u>will not</u> impact your participation in the course.

You will be asked to take a written questionnaire at the start of the study to collect demographic and background information including: age, sex, level of training, previous endoscopy experience and nature of experience, and video game experience, which may correlate with baseline endoscopic skill.

Following this you will take part in a pre-test consisting of the following:

1. **Knowledge Test:** A 30 minute (17 questions) multiple-choice question test designed to assess participants' theoretical knowledge of colonoscopy, including indications, sedation, safety, findings, pathology and follow-up.

Consent Form, Version Date: September 5, 2017 Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy; impact on clinical performance For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 2. VR Simulation Test: This test will assess baseline endoscopic technical proficiency through the completion of a colonoscopy procedure on the VR simulator (EndoVR® Colonoscopy Module 3). This scenario simulates a screening colonoscopy, without the need for any type of intervention (such as biopsy). The time limit of the procedure will be 30 minutes. An expert rater will be present to assess performance, but will not provide assistance. You will be videotaped in order to obtain performance measures, such that your faces are not captured (to ensure anonymity). Prior to starting the procedure, you will complete a questionnaire to measure self-efficacy.

3. VR Simulation Based "Integrated Scenario" Test: Following the simulatoronly test, participants will complete an Integrated Scenario format test to assess their baseline endoscopic non-technical proficiency. This simulated procedure will mimic the setup of an endoscopic suite, as the VR simulator will be positioned next to a patient bed. A standardized patient, who will receive instructions regarding their medical role, will act out a scenario on colon cancer screening. You will be expected to explain the colonoscopy procedure, its benefits and risks, and to obtain procedural consent. You will then carry out the procedure on the VR simulator (EndoVR® Polypectomy Module #3) while responding to the patient and interacting with the standardized nurse (SN) as appropriate. The Standardized Patient (SP) will act out cues from the VR simulator if the simulator signals that the procedure has exceeded its threshold for discomfort. Your performance will be videotaped (in a manner that their faces are not captured to ensure anonymity) in order to obtain performance measures. You will be given a maximum of 45 minutes to complete the procedure.

You will then be randomized, using an online randomization algorithm, to one of two groups:

**Control Group:** This group will receive 4 hours of interactive small-group 1. didactic and hands-on sessions. During these sessions, participants will focus on learning about the theory of colonoscopy, including related concepts of pathology, anatomy, and therapeutic technique. The last session will focus on non-technical skills (NTS) relevant to endoscopy (situation awareness, decision making, communication, teamwork, and leadership) and how they relate to clinical performance. During this session, participants will also watch a video that demonstrates an ideal endoscopic procedure in terms of NTS. as well as learn about the "E-NTS Checklist", which will be provided for them to later use during the integrated scenario training. This checklist has been developed according to evidence-based recommendations and targets non-technical skills. After each didactic session, a short MCQ based on the topics covered in that session will be administered, in keeping with suggestions from the literature regarding "test-enhanced learning". In addition to didactic training, the control group will be given six hours of expert-assisted instruction on both the low-fidelity simulator (1 hour) and on the high-fidelity VR simulator (5 hours). Six modules of increasing difficulty in colonoscopy and colonoscopic polypectomy will be taught using one-on-one feedback from an expert academic endoscopist. The endoscopy instructor will demonstrate techniques, answer

Consent Form, Version Date: September 5, 2017 Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy; impact on clinical performance For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

questions and provide individualized performance feedback on global performance, with a focus on non-technical skills. During training on the high-fidelity simulator, the last two hours will take the form of the integrated scenario, which will feature a standardized patient (SP) and standardized nurse (SN). Terminal feedback will be given after each integrated scenario by the instructor. Finally, the "E-NTS Checklist" will be accessible during training in the integrated scenario, as participants can view the checklist prior to each case and review it after the case.

2. **Intervention Group:** This group will receive the same 4 hours of didactic teaching, and hands-on sessions. The intervention group will also receive the same teaching on both the low-fidelity and high-fidelity simulators. Within the context of the didactic sessions and simulator training, the GIC group will engaged in "gamified practice" in two ways. First, leaderboards will also be used to track and rank participants' performances. Prior to training, participants in the GIC group will watch a tutorial video on the functionality of the leaderboards and subsequently receive an anonymized ID tag that can be used to identify only their position on the leaderboard. Participants will also be informed that awards will be given to the individual who achieves first place. An "introductory" leaderboard, based on technical skills performance during the low-fidelity simulator practice, will be used to familiarize participants with the function of the leaderboard. After practice on the low-fidelity simulator is completed, participants will be introduced to the leaderboard for performance on the VR simulator and didactic sessions. Specifically, this leaderboard will include 4 components: a non-technical skills score, a technical skills score, a cognitive skills score, and an overall ranking, which will be determined through an algorithm that accounts for non-technical, technical and cognitive scores. Scoring of the non-technical and technical skills will be based on assessed performances during practice sessions on the VR simulator using the M-OSANTS and JAG-DOPS, respectively, while the scoring of the cognitive skills will be based on percentage scores of the MCO from the didactic sessions. Scores will be aggregated only from participants training on the same days. The leaderboard will be displayed on a central laptop and/or TV screen and will be accessible at any time throughout the day. Finally, participants in the GIC group will have the opportunity to be rewarded for their performances. One method of reinforcing good performance will be through achievement badges. These badges will be awarded after each scenario on the high-fidelity simulator and will be based on completion, proper technique, and/ or correct identification of pathology. Additionally, the participant who has accumulated the most badges will be awarded a prize.

A post-test will be administered after completion of the training period to compare learning between the two groups, consisting of:

#### 1. Knowledge Test

Knowledge acquisition will be evaluated using a 30 minute (17 questions) multiplechoice question test designed to assess theoretical knowledge of colonoscopy.

#### 2. Simulation-based Assessment

Consent Form, Version Date: September 5, 2017 Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy; impact on clinical performance For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

You will be assessed through the completion of a colonoscopy procedure on the VR simulator. As with the pre-test, the post-test will include an "integrated scenario" which links a standardized patient with the VR colonoscopy simulator. You will once again be required to explain the procedure, its benefits and risks, and obtain informed consent. You will then carry out the procedure on the simulator while responding to the patient as appropriate. Once again, the performance of all participants will be videotaped, such that their faces are not captured to ensure anonymity, in order to obtain performance measures.

#### 3. Patient-based transfer test

You will then be contacted to undertake two colonoscopies on real patients. These procedures will be videotaped in a manner that anonymizes you and the patient. The videotapes will be assessed by two independent blinded expert endoscopists.

#### Potential Harms (Injury/Discomfort/Inconvenience)

There are no known harms associated with participation in this study.

#### **Potential Benefits**

You will not receive credit in performing colonoscopies by participating in this study. You may receive no direct benefits from being in this study. Results from this study will be used to adjust the structure and format of the current University of Toronto virtualreality colonoscopy training curriculum for novice endoscopic trainees.

#### **Confidentiality and Privacy**

All the persons associated with this study, including the study investigators and delegates (study team) are committed to respecting your privacy. No information that discloses your identity will be published or released to any other persons without your consent unless required by law.

Video-recordings of your face are considered to be identifying personal information and will not be shown when videotaping these procedures. During the video-recordings, you are requested not to state your name or the names of anyone else or any institutions. However if this does happen, you should know that the audio track from the video will be removed so identifying information is removed.

Any records, documentation, or information related to you will be coded by study numbers to ensure that persons outside of the study will not be able to identify you. All study data forms will be identified by study code number and not by name. No identifying information about you will be allowed off site. All information that identifies you and study data will be securely stored at St. Michael's Hospital. The video recordings will be securely destroyed after data collection. Other identifying information will be securely destroyed after all the colonoscopy procedures have been completed. The study data will be securely destroyed when the study results have been published, within five years after completion of the study.

It is important to understand that despite these protections being in place, experience in similar studies indicates that there is the risk of unintentional release of information. The principal investigator and study personnel will protect your records and keep all the information in your study file confidential to the greatest extent possible. The chance that this information will accidentally be given to someone else is minimal.

Data collected during this study will not form any part of your evaluation for the rotation and will not be forwarded to your program director or any other individual involved in your evaluation in residency. The study investigators will have access to the coded study data, but will not have access to your identifying information, including the videorecordings. The St. Michael's Hospital Research Ethics Board may have access to your identifying information and study data collected, for the purpose of study monitoring.

In no way does signing this consent form waive your legal rights nor release the investigators or involved institution from their legal and professional responsibilities.

## Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal

Participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to decline participation in this study and to withdraw from the study at any time if you so desire. Whether you participate in this study or not, it will not have any effect on your clinical evaluations, or standing in your academic program at the University of Toronto, nor will it in any way affect your admission to (or current status in) a residency/fellowship program, nor your current or future employment at St. Michael's Hospital. If you withdraw or are withdrawn from the study, information gathered from you up to that point will be kept and used in the study, unless you request that it not be used, and we are able to remove it.

## Study Results

We may present this study at a scientific conference and we intend to write an article about this study for a scientific journal. No identifying information about you will be revealed in any presentation or publication about the study. Study results will be communicated to you by request following completion of the study. You can ask for a copy of the published article by contacting Michael Scaffidi, Research Assistant, at (416) 864-5628 or by e-mail at <u>scaffidim@smh.ca</u>.

## Potential Costs of Participant and Reimbursement to the Participant

Participating in this study will not result in any costs charged to you, and as such, no reimbursements or compensation will be provided.

## <u>Sponsor</u>

 This study is funded by a grant from the University of Toronto.

#### **Compensation for Injury**

If you suffer a physical injury from (the procedure(s) or participation) in this study, medical care will be provided to you in the same manner as you would ordinarily obtain any other medical treatment. In no way does signing this form waive your legal rights nor release the study doctor(s), sponsors or involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities.

#### Participation and Withdrawal

Participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to decline participation in this study and to withdraw from the study at any time if you so desire. Whether you participate in this study or not, it will not have any effect on your participation in the Annual Endoscopic Simulation Course, clinical evaluations, or standing in your academic program at the University of Toronto, nor will it in any way affect your admission to (or current status in) a residency/fellowship program, nor your current or future employment at St. Michael's Hospital. If you withdraw from the study, information gathered from you up to that point will be kept and used in the study, unless you request that it not be used, and we are able to remove it.

#### Can Participation in this Study End Early?

You can choose to end your participation in this study at any time. If you withdraw voluntarily from the study, you are encouraged to contact the Research Coordinator, Michael Scaffidi, Division of Gastroenterology (416-864-5628) immediately.

If you decide to leave the study, the information about you that was collected before you left the study will still be used. No new information will be collected without your permission.

The study investigators have the right to stop your participation in the study if it is not in your best interest to continue or if you do not follow study directions

#### **Research Ethics Board Contact**

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of the Research Ethics Board, St. Michael's Hospital at 416-864-6060 ext. 2557 during regular business hours.

The study protocol and consent form have been reviewed by a committee called the Research Ethics Board at St. Michael's Hospital. The Research Ethics Board is a group of scientists, medical staff, individuals from other backgrounds (including law and ethics) and members of the community. The committee is established by the hospital to review studies for their scientific and ethical merit. The Board pays special attention to the potential harms and benefits involved in participation to the research participant as well as the benefit to society. The committee is also required to do periodic reviews of ongoing research studies. As part of this review, someone may contact you form the Research Ethics Board to discuss your experience in the research study.

## Study Contacts

If you require further information, or have any questions concerning this study, please contact the principal investigator:

Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC Division of Gastroenterology St. Michael's Hospital 16-036 Cardinal Carter Wing 30 Bond Street Toronto, Ontario M5B 1W8 Phone: (416) 864-5628 Fax: (416) 864-5882 E-mail: grovers@smh.ca

Collect calls will be accepted.

You may also contact the research assistant, Michael Scaffidi, at (416)-864-5628 or by email at <u>scaffidim@smh.ca</u>.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your own records.

5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36

37

38

43 44 45

46

47 48

49 50 51

52

53

59

60

# Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy: impact on clinical performance

#### **Principal Investigator**

Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC Division of Gastroenterology St. Michael's Hospital 16-036 Cardinal Carter Wing 30 Bond Street Toronto, Ontario M5B 1W8 Phone: (416) 864-5628 Fax: (416) 864-5882 E-mail: grovers@smh.ca

#### **Declaration of Consent**

The research study has been explained to me, and any questions that I have asked about the study have been answered to my satisfaction. A member of the study team, who has no influence on my academic program, will be obtaining my consent form. I have the right not to participate and the right to withdraw from this study without affecting my participation in the Annual Endoscopic Simulation Course, evaluation or standing on my academic program at the University of Toronto, or any admission to (or current status in) a residency/fellowship program. I have also been informed that my choice will not affect my current or future employment at St. Michael's Hospital. As well, the potential harms and benefits (if any) of participating in this research study have been explained to me. I have been told that I have not waived my legal rights nor released the investigators or involved institution from their legal and professional responsibilities. I know that I may ask now, or in the future, any questions I have about the study. I have been told that records relating to me in this study will be kept confidential and that no information will be released or printed that would disclose my personal identity without my permission unless required by law. I have been given sufficient time to read the above information. I consent to participate in this study. I will be given a signed copy of this consent form.

Name of Participant (print)

Signature

Date

I have explained the study to the above-named participant and discussed the potential risks and benefits (if any) associated with participation in this research study. I have answered all questions asked with respect to this research study.

Name and Position of Person Conducting Consent Discussion (print) Signature of Person Consent Discussion Date

Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy; impact on clinical performance For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

## St. Michael's

Inspired Care. Inspiring Science.

## Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy: impact on clinical performance

#### CONSENT FORM TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY Patient participants

This is a consent form regarding the above mentioned research study. A research study is a way of gathering information on a treatment, procedure or medical device or to answer a question about something that is not well understood. Before you give your consent to be a volunteer, it is important that you read the following information and ask as many questions as necessary to be sure you understand what you will be asked to do.

#### **Investigators**

Principal Investigator:

Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC Division of Gastroenterology St. Michael's Hospital 16-036 Cardinal Carter Wing 30 Bond Street Toronto, Ontario M5B 1W8 Phone: (416) 864-5628 Fax: (416) 864-5882 E-mail: grovers@smh.ca

#### **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

We have no known actual, apparent, potential or perceived conflicts of interest in conducting this study.

#### FUNDING SOURCE

This study is funded by a grant provided by the University of Toronto, Division of Gastroenterology.

#### **PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH**

You are being asked to consider participating in this study because you are booked to have a colonoscopy.

Colonoscopy is a technically challenging procedure and it requires considerable training to learn the skill. Increasingly trainees that learn these skills are learning them on high-fidelity virtual reality simulators that have been designed to teach colonoscopy, prior to performance on real patients. Although simulation-based practice is being integrated into endoscopy training curricula, there is no consensus on the best way to how to do this. One method that has been used in surgical simulation is to interlace a lecture-based curriculum with supervised procedures with feedback with experts. It is unknown whether this provides better learning than self-directed endoscopic procedural learning.

The purpose of this study is to compare performance on colonoscopies performed on a virtual reality endoscopic simulator between two groups of beginning endoscopists, one trained with a curriculum that using gamficiation and one trained with a curriculum that uses conventional simulationtraining.

#### **DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH**

#### WHAT WILL HAPPEN DURING THIS STUDY?

Two physician assessors will be asked to evaluate the performance of the physician performing your colonoscopy. In order to assess the performance, videotaping is required. The physicians will use standardized tests for performance of colonoscopy in order to perform the assessment. To ensure anonymity, your face and the endoscopist's face will not be recorded. Two views of the procedure will be captured at the same time: 1) a close-up view of the endoscopist's gloved hands using the control knobs and tube of the colonoscope and 2) the view obtained by the colonoscope's camera which shows the inside of the your bowel.

You will be asked, in person, to provide some personal health information including your age, gender, the reason why you having the colonoscopy procedure and if you have any history of a difficult colonoscopy or if you have had surgery in the past to remove part of your bowel.

#### HOW MANY PEOPLE WILL TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?

It is anticipated that about 120 people (80 patients and 40 endoscopists) will participate in this study at St. Michael's Hospital. The study is expected to take three years to complete.

#### WHAT ARE THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF STUDY PARTICIPANTS?

All data will be collected during your scheduled colonoscopy procedure time. Participation in this study will take no additional time and the duration of your colonoscopy procedure itself will not be affected.

If you decide to participate in this study you will be asked to do the following:

(1) Provide one of the study investigators, in person, with some personal health information including your age, gender, the reason why you are having the colonoscopy procedure and if you have any history of a difficult colonoscopy or have had surgery in the past to remove part of their bowel.

(2) Agree to allow your colonoscopy procedure to be videotaped during this study. Your name and face will not be shown to the camera.

#### POTENTIAL HARMS (Injury, discomfort, inconvenience)

You may experience side effects from participating in this study. Some of these risks we know about. There is also the possibility of risk that we do not know about or have not seen in study subjects to date. Some of these can be managed. If you decide to take part in this study, you should contact Dr. Samir C. Grover (Division of Gastroenterology, St. Michael's Hospital, 416-864-5628) if you think you have side effects even if you think it has nothing to do with the study.

The risks we know of are:

There are no direct short- or long-term risks anticipated. Data collected will be kept completely confidential and anonymous. Even though the risk that a participant's data could become public is very small, it can never be completely eliminated. However, every precaution is taken to prevent this. Any data collected during the study (e.g. performance assessments, videotaped performance) will be identified using only an individualized number known only to the principal investigator (Drs. Grover) so that your privacy is protected.

#### POTENTIAL BENEFITS

There is no benefit to you from your participation in this study.

#### **PROTECTING YOUR INFORMATION**

You have the right to have any information about you that is collected, used or disclosed for this research study to be handled in a confidential manner. No information that discloses your identity may be released or published without your consent. All information obtained during the study will be held in strict confidence. Even though the risk that your data could become public is very small, it can never be completely eliminated. However, every precaution is taken to prevent this. Prior to starting the study, you will be assigned a unique code known only to the principal investigator (Dr. Grover) so that your privacy is protected. Any data collected during the study will be identified using only this code.

The file which links your unique study identifier with your name is the only source of information that could possibly be utilized, either alone or with other information, to identify you. This encrypted file will be kept behind locked doors in Dr. Samir Grover's office, St. Michael's Hospital until data analysis is complete (anticipated time frame: 5 years). After that time it will be securely destroyed as per hospital requirements. Only Dr. Grover (principal investigator) will have access to this file.

Any study data about you that is sent outside of the hospital will be aggregate data for research presentations and publications. No individual level data will be reported .

The investigator(s), study staff and the other people listed above will keep the information they see or receive about you confidential, including personal health information, to the extent permitted by applicable laws. Even though the risk of identifying you from the study data is very small, it can never be completely eliminated. Experience in similar studies indicates that the

greatest risk in this study to you is the unintentional release of information from your health records. The study doctor will protect your records and keep confidential all the information in your study file, including your name, address and telephone number. The chance that this information will accidentally be given to someone else is small.

You have the right to have any information about you and your health that is collected, used or disclosed for this research study to be handled in a confidential manner.

If you agree to join this study, the study doctor and his/her study team will look at your personal health information and collect only the information they need for the study. Personal health information is any information that could be used to identify you and includes your name, address, date of birth, new or existing medical records, that includes types, dates and results of medical tests or procedures.

Access to your personal health information will take place under the supervision of the Principal Investigator. The information that is collected for the study will be kept in a locked and secure area by the study doctor for 5 years. Only the study team or the people or groups listed below will be allowed to look at your records. Your participation in this study also may be recorded in your medical record at this hospital.

The following people may come to the hospital to look at the study records and at your personal health information to check that the information collected for the study is correct and to make sure the study followed proper laws and guidelines:

• Representatives of the St. Michael's Hospital Ethics Board, a group of people who oversee the ethical conduct of research studies at St. Michael's Hospital

The investigators plan to publish the results of this study. You will not be named in any reports, publications, or presentations that my come from this study. Only group data will be presented.

#### STUDY RESULTS

As mentioned, the investigators plan to publish the results of this study. Once the study has been completed, you can contact Dr. Samir C. Grover (416-864-5628) to obtain a copy of the results.

#### POTENTIAL COSTS OF PARTICIPATION AND REIMBURSEMENT TO THE PARTICIPANT

You will not have to pay for any of the procedures involved in this study. There is no reimbursement associated with participation in this study.

#### **COMPENSATION FOR INJURY**

If you suffer a physical injury from participation in this study, medical care will be provided to you in the same manner as you would ordinarily obtain any other medical treatment. In no way does signing this form waive your legal rights nor release the study investigators, sponsors, or other involved institutions from their legal and professional responsibilities.

## PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

Participation in any research study is voluntary. If you choose to participate in this study, you can change your mind without reason and withdraw from the study any time up to 5 years. After 5 years, your data will be anonymized and it will no longer be possible to identify which data are yours. In addition, it you decide to decline participation or withdraw from the study at any time, this will have no impact on the care you or your family will receive at St. Michael's Hospital.

#### **CAN PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY END EARLY?**

You can choose to end your participation in this study at any time. If you withdraw voluntarily from the study, you are encouraged to contact Dr. Samir C. Grover, Division of Gastroenterology (416-864-5628) immediately.

If you decide to leave the study, the information about you that was collected before you left the study will still be used. No new information will be collected without your permission.

The study investigators have the right to stop your participation in the study if it is not in your best interest to continue or if you do not follow study directions.

#### **RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD CONTACT**

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact Chair of the Research Ethics Board at 416-864-6060 ext. 2557 during business hours.

The study protocol and consent form have been reviewed by a committee called the Research Ethics Board at St. Michael's Hospital. The Research Ethics Board is a group of scientists, medical staff, individuals from other backgrounds (including law and ethics) and members of the community. The committee is established by the hospital to review studies for their scientific and ethical merit. The Board pays special attention to the potential harms and benefits involved in participation to the research participant as well as the benefit to society. The committee is also required to do periodic reviews of ongoing research studies. As part of this review, someone may contact you form the Research Ethics Board to discuss your experience in the research study.

#### **STUDY CONTACTS**

If you have any questions, concerns or would like to speak to the study team for any reason, please call Dr. Samir C. Grover at 416-864-5628.

#### **INFORMED CONSENT**

Study Title: Gamification of a virtual-reality simulation curriculum in endoscopy: impact on clinical performance

Principal investigator:

Dr. Samir C. Grover, MD, MEd, FRCPC
Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Medicine
St. Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto
416-864-5628 (available Mon to Fri 9:00 AM – 5:00 PM)

The research study has been explained to me and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have been informed of the alternatives to participation in this study. I have the right not to participate and the right to withdraw without affecting the quality of medical care at St. Michael's Hospital for me and for other members of my family. As well, the potential harms and benefits (if any) of participating in this research study have been explained to me. I have been told that I have not waived my legal rights nor released the investigators, sponsors, or involved institutions of their legal and professional responsibilities. I know that I may ask now, or in the future, any questions I have about the study. I have been told that study records relating to me will be kept confidential and that no information will be disclosed without my permission unless required by law. I have been given sufficient time to read the above information.

I consent to participate. I have been told that I will be given a signed copy of this consent form.

Signature

Date

I **agree** to allow my colonoscopy procedure to be videotaped during this study as described in this consent form.

I **do not agree** to allow my colonoscopy procedure to be videotaped during this study as described in this consent form.

Person obtaining consent

By signing this form, I confirm that:

• This study and its purpose has been explained to the participant named above

- All questions asked by the participant have been answered
- I will give a copy of this signed and dated document to the participant

Name of person obtaining	Signature	Date
consent (print)		
ASSISTANCE DECLARATION	$\Box$ (check here if not applicable)	

Consent form (patient) Version Date 2017 July 24 2017 Page 6 of 7 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml The participant/substitute decision-maker was assisted during the consent process as follows

2
2
5
4
5
c
0
7
8
0
9
10
11
10
12
13
1/
14
15
16
17
17
18
19
20
20
21
22
23
24
25
20
26
27
28
20
29
30
21
51
32
33
24
54
35
36
27
37
38
39
40
40
41
42
. <u>-</u> 12
43
44
45
16
40
47
48
10
49
50
51
57
52
53
54
57
55
56
57
57
58
59

60

(please check the relevant box and	complete the signature space	below):	
The person signing below acted and attests that the study as set out questions answered	as a translator for the partici in this form was accurately t	ipant during the const ranslated and has had	ent process l any
I have been requested to interpret th (). of choice of the potential participan research study. I agree to keep cor I have interpreted the consent discu own language that he/she has been his/her participation, including the consent to participate in this study.	he consent discussion for the I am competent in the Eng at (	potential research pa lish language and in ). I am not invol ation of the potential pant has advised me in study, the nature and l participant freely gi	articipant the language ved in the participant. n his/her extent of ves his/her
Printed Name of Interpreter	Signature	of Interpreter	Date
Relationship or Position of Interpreter	Contact Information of Int	erpreter sion-maker, and the p	person
signing below attests that the study the participant/substitute decision-r	was accurately explained to, naker.	, and apparently unde	erstood by,
	(	2	Print
Name of Witness	Signature	1	Date
Relationship to Participant			

 BMJ Open



SPIRIT 2013 Checklist: Recommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents\*

Section/item	ltem No	Description				
Administrative information						
Title	1	Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, intervention and, if applicable, trial acronym				
Trial registration	2a	Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry				
	2b	All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set				
Protocol version	3	Date and version identifier				
Funding	4	Sources and types of financial, material, and other support				
Roles and	5a	Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors				
responsibilities	5b	Name and contact information for the trial sponsor				
	5c	Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection management, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the rep and the decision to submit the report for publication, including whet they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities				
	5d	Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee, endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups overseeing the trial, if applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee)				
Introduction						
Background and rationale	6a	Description of research question and justification for undertaking th trial, including summary of relevant studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervention				
	6b	Explanation for choice of comparators				
Objectives	7	Specific objectives or hypotheses				
Trial design	8	Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework (				

1 2	
3 4	
5	
7	
8 9	
10 11	
12 13	
14	
16	
17 18	
19 20	
21 22	
23 24	
25	
20	
28 29	
30 31	
32 33	
34 35	
36	
38	
39 40	
41 42	
43 44	
45 46	
47	
40 49	
50 51	
52 53	
54 55	
56 57	
58	
59 60	

Methods: Partici	pants,	interventions, and outcomes
Study setting	9	Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained
Eligibility criteria	10	Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists)
Interventions	11a	Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered
	11b	Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease)
	11c	Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence (eg, drug tablet return, laboratory tests)
	11d	Relevant concomitant care and interventions that are permitted or prohibited during the trial
Outcomes	12	Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific measurement variable (eg, systolic blood pressure), analysis metric (eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of aggregation (eg, median, proportion), and time point for each outcome. Explanation of the clinical relevance of chosen efficacy and harm outcomes is strongly recommended
Participant timeline	13	Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for participants. A schematic diagram is highly recommended (see Figure)
Sample size	14	Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study objectives and how it was determined, including clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any sample size calculations
Recruitment	15	Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach target sample size
Methods: Assign	ment o	of interventions (for controlled trials)
Allocation:		
Sequence generation	16a	Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg, computer- generated random numbers), and list of any factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg, blocking) should be provided in a separate document that is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign interventions
		that is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign interventions

1 2 3 4 5	Allocation concealment mechanism	16b	Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg, central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the sequence until interventions are assigned
6 7 8	Implementation	16c	Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol participants, and who will assign participants to interventions
9 10 11 12	Blinding (masking)	17a	Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial participants, care providers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and how
14 15 16 17		17b	If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's allocated intervention during the trial
18	Methods: Data co	llectio	n, management, and analysis
20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Data collection methods	18a	Plans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other trial data, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a description of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if not in the protocol
27 28 29 30 31		18b	Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from intervention protocols
32 33 34 35 36	Data management	19	Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, double data entry; range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data management procedures can be found, if not in the protocol
37 38 39 40	Statistical methods	20a	Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes. Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the protocol
41 42 43		20b	Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted analyses)
44 45 46 47 48		20c	Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple imputation)
49	Methods: Monitor	ing	
50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	Data monitoring	21a	Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of whether it is independent from the sponsor and competing interests; and reference to where further details about its charter can be found, if not in the protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is not needed
60	For pee	r review	/ only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 3

	21b	Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim results and make the final decision to terminate the trial
Harms	22	Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously reported adverse events and other unintended effects of trial interventions or trial conduct
Auditing	23	Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent from investigators and the sponsor
Ethics and dissen	ninatio	n
Research ethics /	24	Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval
Protocol amendments	25	Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility criteria, outcomes, analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators)
Consent or assent	26a	Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32)
	26b	Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary studies, if applicable
Confidentiality	27	How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained in order to protect confidentiality before, during, and after the trial
Declaration of interests	28	Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site
Access to data	29	Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contractual agreements that limit such access for investigators
Ancillary and post-trial care	30	Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial participation
Dissemination policy	31a	Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions
	31b	Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers
	31c	Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant- level dataset, and statistical code

Appendices		
Informed consent materials	32	Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authorised surrogates
Biological specimens	33	Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of biological specimens for genetic or molecular analysis in the current trial and for future use in ancillary studies, if applicable

\*It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the SPIRIT 2013 Explanation & Elaboration for important clarification on the items. Amendments to the protocol should be tracked and dated. The SPIRIT checklist is copyrighted by the SPIRIT Group under the Creative Commons "Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported" license. or beer territor on the