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ABSTRACT

Introduction: High-acuity patients are typically transported directly to the emergency centre via ambulance by trained prehospital care providers. As such, the emergency centre becomes the first of many physical transition points for patients, where a change of care provider (or handover) takes place. The aim of this study was to describe the variables perceived to be important during patient handover by a cohort of South African prehospital care providers.

Methods: A purpose-designed questionnaire was used to gather data related to prehospital emergency care provider opinions on the importance of certain patient variables.

Results: We collected 175 completed questionnaires from 75 (43%) BAA, 49 (28%) ANA, 15 (9%) ECT, 16 (9%) ANT and 20 (11%) ECP respondents. Within the ten handover variables perceived to be most important for inclusion in emergency centre handover, five were related to vital signs. Blood pressure was ranked most important, followed by type of major injuries, anatomical location of major injuries, pulse rate, respiration rate and patient history. These were followed by Glasgow Coma Score, injuries sustained, patient priority, oxygen saturations and patient allergies.

Conclusion: This study has provided some interesting results related to which handover elements prehospital care providers consider as most important to include in handover. More research is required to correlate these findings with the opinions of emergency centre staff.

African relevance

• There is a paucity of literature related to handover within the African context.
• Adverse events as a result of poor handover have a significant cost implication that the resource-constrained healthcare system can ill-afford.
• Identification of the importance of handover variables for inclusion in emergency centre handover have the potential to improve handover.

Introduction

Within the South African context, high-acuity patients are typically transported directly to the emergency centre via ambulance by trained prehospital care providers. As such, the emergency centre becomes the first of many physical transition points for patients, where a change of care provider (or handover) takes place [1]. An appropriate handover, conveying all the essential clinical and associated information, is essential to ensure continuity of care for patients [2]. This continuity of care is achievable only through well-coordinated interactions between the different health professionals involved in a particular handover, whether roadside to hospital, or between teams in the hospital [3].

Handover is a complex process and a number of different definitions have been proposed, largely as consensus on a particular definition has not prevailed [4–7]. Not all of these adequately convey the message that handover is both a compound noun as well as a phrasal verb. We summarised what we believe to be the important aspects of the various definitions in a definition in Box 1.

Error in handover has the potential to adversely affect continuity of care [2]. Although few studies have linked handover to harm, it seems unlikely that handover is an innocuous process [8]. Known potential harm surrounding poor handover practice includes an increased incidence of clinical error, delayed treatment, longer patient stay and...
unnecessary use of clinical resources [9–13]. In essence, improvement in handover practice has the potential to improve safety [14]. What is not quite clear are the specific variables that contribute to safe handover and consequently safe continuation of clinical care.

The aim of this study was to describe the variables perceived to be important during patient handover by a cohort of South African prehospital care providers.

Methods

A purpose-designed questionnaire was used to determine what variables prehospital care providers perceived to be important for inclusion at handover. To determine the variables to include in the questionnaire, a literature search was performed using PubMed (MEDLINE) in conjunction with the uJoogle search engine (© Innovative Interfaces, Inc. Emeryville, CA). Terms that were searched included ‘handover’, ‘hand over’, ‘handoff’, ‘hand-off’ as well as variations of these that included the word ‘patient’. The abstracts of accessible articles were read and where found to be broadly relevant to the study aim, the full article was downloaded. Downloaded articles were further scrutinised and classified according to relevance. It is notable that there were few articles that directly dealt with prehospital to emergency centre handover. Variables associated with prehospital to emergency centre handover were extracted and ranked for frequency of reference in the articles. The most commonly referred to variables were then included in the questionnaire (Annexure A). A pilot study was carried to address reliability and validity of the questionnaire. The pilot study sample was made up of a selection of prehospital care providers with different training backgrounds. Prehospital emergency care personnel register with the Health Professions Council of South Africa and scope directly relates to registration category. In terms of training the personnel register with the Health Professions Council of South Africa and scope directly relates to registration category. In terms of training the study aim, the full article was downloaded. Downloaded articles were possible to track the exact number of questionnaires distributed and thus the cross-tabling participants’ registration category with their field experience. We calculated the median and interquartile range for the various experience categories using existing functions in Excel®. Responses for the questionnaire were recorded and frequencies calculated for each response using existing functions in Excel®. Data for the handover variables were used to determine percentage responses for each handover variable’s level of importance. The percentage responses were used to determine which handover variables had the highest percentage of ‘Critically important’ responses. Handover variables were ranked from most to least important using the percentage of responses that had indicated that the variable was critically important. ‘No response’ responses were excluded from the dataset and resultant calculations.

The study was approved by the University of Cape Town Faculty of Health Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC/REF: 624/2012).

Results

We collected 175 completed questionnaires from 75 (43%) BAA, 49 (28%) ANA, 15 (9%) ECT, 16 (9%) ANT and 20 (11%) ECP respondents. Questionnaires were distributed personally and on the request of some potential respondents, were left at the place of work in a box for completion at a time convenient to them. This meant that it was not possible to track the exact number of questionnaires distributed and completed to determine a response rate. All questionnaires collected were used in the data and there were no questionnaires excluded.

Table 1 describes the importance ranking of handover information variables for the prehospital emergency care provider population sampled. Levels of importance were determined using the percentage of respondents who assigned a critical level of importance to each information variable. No responses were excluded from the dataset.

Respondents’ levels of experience in the prehospital emergency care environment are described in Table 2.

Discussion

Within the ten handover variables perceived to be most important,
important were hypotensive episode prehospital (thirteenth), ECG analysis (fourteenth) and EtCO₂ (nineteenth). Interestingly, temperature was ranked twenty-seventh most important. The dynamic nature of patient illness and presentation means that each variable also has a contextual value. This is demonstrated in the low ranking of temperature. In the hypo- or hyperthermic patient, temperature would become a critical variable to include in handover. The same argument could be made for variables related to trauma patients and medical patients where variables such as mechanism of injury or past medical history would have contextual relevance.

A number of variables related specifically to the trauma patient were also assigned a relative importance for handover. Type of major injuries and anatomical location of these injuries were ranked second and third respectively. Time since incident ranked relatively low at sixteenth but this may have been due to the contextual nature of the patient or may have been due to the acute setting in the emergency centre not being immediately concerned with timelines. In addition to these, information variables specific to the motor vehicle accident patient; death of an occupant in the same compartments and whether or not the patient was restrained ranked seventeenth and eighteenth respectively. Where relevant, these variables would carry a greater importance than in the generic patient presenting to the emergency centre.

Patient history is an important part of contextualising the patient within the construct of the current chief complaint. The patient history assists in the identification of co-morbidities and in light of this, there may be areas of the history that are patient-dependent. Generic patient history was ranked sixth and there were no other handover variables specifically related to the patient’s medical history in the top ten. Allegies was ranked eleventh, patient medications fifteenth and past medical history twentieth. Other variables related to patient history included patient mobility (twenty-first), past surgical history (twenty-third) and patient demographics (twenty-eighth). The importance of patient history is often determined by the nature of the chief complaint. The fact that these variables rank so low may be a cause for concern. The data suggests that identification of pre-existing medical conditions may not enjoy the priority that perhaps it should.

Currently described mnemonics do not classify the importance of patient variables. The first items for handover in many mnemonics do not seem to enjoy congruency with the variables identified as important from this study. In fact the opposite appears to be true. Information related to patient demographics were classified low on this importance scale (both age and gender in the bottom three) whereas they form the first information in DeMlSCO mnemonic [15]. Similarly, mechanism of injury and situation information both of which are part of the initial information exchange in the MIST [16] and SBAR [17] mnemonics also scored low on the importance scale.

It is interesting to note that the Triage Early Warning Score (TEWS) score was the fourth lowest ranked variable. The TEWS Score has been adopted quite extensively in the Western Cape province [18]. This has seemingly not been the case within the Gauteng Province prehospital emergency care population where this study was conducted. This serves to further highlight the discrepancies in practice between provinces within South Africa. Perhaps it is time to start asking questions important to how practice standardisation has the potential to affect continuity of care.

There are a number of mnemonics that are used to facilitate better handover [19]. None of these categorise the importance of the information that they seek to include. In addition, it does not appear that any of these mnemonics were conceptualised with the aim of handing over important information first. The discrepancies in importance placed on variables by different prehospital emergency care providers and the incongruence with commonly used handover mnemonics highlights just how far from standard information transfer current handover practices are. Qualification and experience differences and varying patient acuities may be contributing factors.

Table 1
Importance of handover information variables ranked from most to least important.

| Information variable                  | Critically Important % (N=) | Important % (N=) | Somewhat Important % (N=) | Unimportant % (N=) |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Blood pressure                       | 73% (127)                  | 26% (45)        | 1% (2)                   | 0% (0)            |
| Type of major injuries               | 68% (114)                  | 29% (49)        | 1% (2)                   | 1% (2)            |
| Anatomical location of major injuries| 64% (103)                  | 32% (51)        | 4% (7)                   | 0% (0)            |
| Pulse rate                           | 64% (111)                  | 33% (57)        | 2% (4)                   | 1% (1)            |
| Respiration rate                     | 63% (109)                  | 34% (60)        | 3% (5)                   | 0% (0)            |
| History                              | 63% (34)                   | 31% (17)        | 6% (3)                   | 0% (0)            |
| Glasgow Coma Score                   | 59% (99)                   | 36% (61)        | 5% (8)                   | 0% (0)            |
| Injuries sustained                   | 58% (33)                   | 40% (23)        | 0% (0)                   | 2% (1)            |
| Patient priority                     | 55% (42)                   | 41% (31)        | 4% (3)                   | 0% (0)            |
| SpO₂ (oxygen saturation)             | 51% (87)                   | 43% (73)        | 4% (7)                   | 2% (3)            |

* SpO₂ = blood oxygen saturations measured with a non-invasive pulse oximeter.
* ECG = electrocardiograph.
* CO₂ = carbon dioxide.
* TEWS = Triage Early Warning Score.

Table 2
Respondents’ levels of experience.

| HPSCA register | < 5 years % (N=) | 5 to 10 years % (N=) | 10 to 15 years % (N=) | > 15 years % (N=) | Median (IQR)* |
|----------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|---------------|
| BAA            | 38% (20)         | 46% (24)             | 12% (6)              | 4% (2)           | 6 (6)         |
| ANA            | 9% (4)           | 25% (11)             | 39% (17)             | 27% (12)         | 13 (8)        |
| ECT            | 21% (3)          | 36% (5)              | 29% (4)              | 14% (2)          | 10 (7.25)     |
| ANT            | 6% (1)           | 31% (5)              | 25% (4)              | 38% (6)          | 14.5 (11.75)  |
| ECP            | 22% (4)          | 33% (6)              | 28% (5)              | 17% (3)          | 6.5 (7)       |
| Total          | 22% (32)         | 35% (51)             | 25% (36)             | 17% (25)         |               |

* IQR = interquartile range.

five were related to vital signs. Blood pressure was ranked as the most important variable and pulse rate was fourth most important, respiration rate fifth, Glasgow Coma Score seventh most important and SpO₂ tenth most important. Other physiological variables also deemed
Most prehospital emergency care provider (80%, n = 118) had less than ten years of workplace experience. The highest number of respondents (n = 63) had less than five years of workplace experience. The ECT, ANT and ECP respondents had the highest proportions of respondents with less than five years of experience. There are proportionately lower numbers of registered prehospital emergency care personnel in these categories [20]. This is compounded by the numbers of advanced life support prehospital emergency care providers who leave the country to find work elsewhere [21]. There is usually a minimum clinical experience timeframe required for expatriate work, meaning that many higher qualified practitioners with experience have left the South African healthcare sector.

Conclusion

This is potentially the first study where an attempt has been made to rank specific patient variables in order of importance for inclusion in emergency centre handover. This study has provided some interesting results related to which handover variables prehospital care providers consider as most important to include in handover.

The perceived importance of patient variables may be an indicator of which patient variables should be standardised for inclusion into handover. Further studies are required to determine the levels of importance assigned to specific patient variables by receiving staff in the emergency centre. Other areas requiring further research include the determination of the objective value of these variables on patient care, triage code and mortality and morbidity. This may objectively assist in the development of future handover protocols.
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