

The preparedness and response to COVID-19 in a quaternary Intensive Care Unit in Australia: perspectives and insights from frontline critical care clinicians

¹Krishnaswamy Sundararajan, ²Peng Bi, ³Adriana Milazzo, ⁴Alexis Poole, ⁵Benjamin Reddi, ⁶Mohammad Afzal Mahmood

¹Staff Specialist, Intensive Care Unit, Royal Adelaide Hospital and Discipline of Acute Care Medicine, The University of Adelaide

²Professor, School of Public Health, The University of Adelaide

³Senior Lecturer, School of Public Health, The University of Adelaide

⁴Critical Care Registered Nurse, Intensive Care Unit, Royal Adelaide Hospital and Discipline of Acute Care Medicine, The University of Adelaide

⁵Staff Specialist, Intensive Care Unit, Royal Adelaide Hospital and Discipline of Acute Care Medicine, The University of Adelaide

⁶Senior Lecturer, School of Public Health, The University of Adelaide and Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia.

Word count: 4080 (excluding title page, abstract, acknowledgements, references, figures, and tables)

Corresponding author:

Dr Krishnaswamy Sundararajan

Head of Unit

Level 4, Intensive Care Unit

Royal Adelaide Hospital

Port Road

Adelaide, South Australia-5000

Phone: +61 (8) 70741751

Mobile: + 61 457871277

E-mail: krishnaswamy.sundararajan@adelaide.edu.au

Funding source(s): None

Conflict of interest statement: None

Declarations: None

Keywords: COVID-19, Intensive Care Unit, Preparedness, Response, Hospital Management, Communication, Resilience, Command and Control

Running head: Qualitative study among ICU clinicians in managing COVID 19

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our appreciation to all the critical care nurses and intensivists who participated actively in the in-depth interviews and focus group discussions. We would like to thank Dr Shagufta Perveen from the University of Adelaide for her professional assistance with transcription. We would also like to thank Dr Kathryn Zeitz, Director of Clinical Governance at the Central Adelaide Local Health Network for her support and permission to use the COSTAT matrix.

Contributions

KS was involved with the conceptualisation of the study, literature review, ethics application, conduct of the study and investigation, methodology and writing the original draft. PB was involved with the methodology, data analysis editing the manuscript. AM was involved with the writing review. AP and BR were involved with the ethics submission, methodology, data analysis and writing review. MAM was involved with literature review, methodology, data analysis and editing the manuscript.

Patient or substitute decision maker's consent for publication: Not applicable

Data sharing statement: Data has been stored with the University of Adelaide repository and will be provided on request

ABSTRACT

Objectives: This study was conducted to explore the perspectives and opinions of Intensive Care Unit (ICU) nurses and doctors at a COVID-19 designated pandemic hospital concerning the preparedness and response to COVID-19 and to consolidate the lessons learnt for crisis/disaster management in the future.

Design: A qualitative study using in-depth interviews (IDIs) and focus group discussions (FGDs). Purposeful sampling was conducted to identify participants. A semi-structured guide was utilised to facilitate in-depth interviews with individual participants. Two focus group discussions were conducted, one with the ICU doctors and another with the ICU nurses. Thematic analysis identified themes and subthemes informing about the level of preparedness, response measures, processes, and factors that were either facilitators or those that triggered challenges.

Setting: ICU in a quaternary referral centre affiliated to a university teaching COVID-19 designated pandemic hospital, in Adelaide, South Australia.

Participants: The participants included eight ICU doctors and eight ICU nurses for the in-depth interviews. Another sixteen clinicians participated in focus group discussions.

Results: The study identified six themes relevant to preparedness for, and responses to, COVID-19. The themes included: (1) Staff competence and planning, (2) Information transfer and communication, (3) Education and skills for the safe use of PPE, (4) Team dynamics and clinical practice, (5) leadership, and (6) Managing End-of life situations and expectations of caregivers.

Conclusion: Findings highlight that preparedness and response to the COVID-19 crisis were proportionate to the situation's gravity. More enablers than barriers were identified. However, opportunities for improvement were recognised in the domains of planning, logistics, self-sufficiency with equipment, operational and strategic oversight, communication, and managing end-of-life care.

ARTICLE SUMMARY

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This is the first study that provided insights about clinicians' perspectives and viewpoints to preparing and responding to COVID-19 in Australia.
- The study used qualitative methodological framework allowing participants to provide in-depth accounts of processes and enabling factors and barriers.
- Our study provides information on issues that needs to be addressed from a critical care viewpoint and interventions that were effective and efficient
- This is a single-center study in a developed country where experience is vastly different from other centers with higher demand and fewer resources
- We acknowledge the potential for selection bias because of the qualitative design

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic caused by the pathogen severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) presents an ongoing public health threat with the possibility of a massive influx of critically ill patients into a system with limited capacity despite the recent rollout of vaccination programs. Sharing guidance [1] between various hospitals at a national level could promote effective planning as the burden on ICU resources in the context of COVID-19 is likely to be significant. Many features of the current crisis make sustained surge capacity [2] a concern. In these circumstances, a command-and-control model is often instituted as a strategy to delineate roles and responsibilities, ensure appropriate allocation of resources, and maintain clinical service delivery, including business as usual. This model's utility in facilitating a coordinated response to COVID-19 pandemic in an ICU has not been fully explored.

The short, medium, and long-term consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic are still very uncertain. Therefore, clinicians in the field of intensive care medicine have relied on existing evidence-based policies, procedures and guidelines promulgated by professional bodies.[3] A respected source of information [4] in the Australian context has been the Australia and New Zealand Intensive Care Society guidelines. These guidelines along with government directives [5] cover the practical aspects concerning the use of personal protective equipment (PPE) and isolation rooms. The uptake and compliance with these guidelines and directives related to COVID-19 among frontline clinicians working in an ICU, however, have not been fully elucidated.

Further, managing end-of-life care for patients with COVID-19 has been challenging. Intensive care resources are used quite commonly in managing terminal hospitalisations and end-of-life care in the developed world [6]. Coupled with the emerging body of evidence in relation to prognostication and fatality rates [7, 8] around COVID-19, the presumed increase in the infectivity of patients at the end of life compounds the challenges of providing good palliative care [9]. In Australasian ICUs, the standards in relation to consumer engagement and comprehensive care including end-of-life care highlight the importance of dealing with patients and their substitute decision makers with empathy and compassion [10-12].

Rationale

The perspectives of those directly involved in the care of COVID-19 patients in an ICU and the level of preparedness in terms of competence and infrastructure for providing care for patients with a highly transmissible disease are unknown. By 'competence' we mean the skills and knowledge needed for managing COVID-19 in a critically ill patient. In the same vein, the processes by which staff adapt and prevail in those circumstances, and barriers and enablers in communicating effectively in a pandemic, particularly within the governance of a crisis management framework are not well understood. In addition, given the dynamic nature of the pandemic, the practical relevance and utility of simulation sessions in educating and empowering frontline clinicians in undertaking high-risk procedures is not clear. Moreover, managing end-of-life situations, during COVID-19 in an Australian context, is not well understood. This study addresses these knowledge gaps.

Objectives

This study explored the perspectives and opinions of ICU nurses and doctors in relation to the preparedness and response to COVID-19 and identify enablers and barriers to consolidate knowledge for future crisis/disaster management in a quaternary referral ICU in a hospital designated for pandemics.

METHODOLOGY

Study design

Using phenomenology [13,14], we adopted a qualitative approach [15,16] to explore the participants' perspectives and viewpoints, using in-depth interviews (IDIs) as well as focus-group discussions (FGDs). The structure and the topics explored were the same in the IDIs and FGDs. The study was designed to allow exploration of the lived experience of critical-care professionals, not only in terms of preparedness but also in terms of their response to the pandemic as an interpretive process and this aligned with hermeneutic (interpretive) phenomenological approach [17]. The guidelines for standard reporting of qualitative research were upheld for that methodology [18]

Setting

The study was conducted in a 48-bedded ICU of an 800- bedded quaternary hospital in Australia between August and October 2020, where critically ill patients with COVID-19 were being managed. The COVID status matrix illustrating the horizontally and vertically integrated, command and control structure named COSTAT was used for crisis management and around the time of this crisis, the organisation reached the maximum staging of COSTAT 4. (See supplemental file)

The COSTAT matrix reflected the fact that while critical decisions were centrally regulated at the organisational level (control: vertical); decisions were also made at various levels within the ICU (command: horizontal)

Study participants

Purposeful sampling was undertaken to recruit participants from the medical and nursing divisions of the ICU. These frontline clinicians were approached at ICU staff forums which provided the opportunity to apprise the clinicians about the study and solicit their participation. For those who expressed interest, further sessions were arranged at a mutually convenient time to discuss the study in more detail, explaining the aims, methods, ethical considerations, potential risks, and a recourse to withdrawal of consent at any stage. A total of 18 respondents were invited for the in-depth interviews, of whom 16 accepted to be interviewed. For the focus group discussions, 25 staff members were invited, of whom 16 were able to participate. There was no remuneration for those who participated. The interviews were conducted between 10th August 2020 and 27th October 2020. The discussion topics were generated based on a pilot run and around the practical issues that mattered the most to all staff around that time

Governance

This study was approved by the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, Human Research Ethics Committee (Reference number 13363).

IDIs and FGDs were conducted after obtaining fully informed, written, and signed consent from each study participant. We ensured the participants' confidentiality by allocating a unique study number to their interviews, and we de-identified participants' details for both in-depth interviews and focus-group discussions.

Patient and public involvement: No patients, substitute decision makers or members of public were involved in this study.

Data curation and Reflexivity

As data curator, the first author led the process of data collection for the face-to-face IDIs and FGDs. Lived experience along with the views and perceptions of frontline clinicians at the coalface was best elucidated by the IDIs. The FGDs complemented the interviews' findings through their ability to corral team members, cross-validate their opinions and perceptions and consolidate their views.

(Insert Table 1 here)

Table 1:

Structure for in-depth interviews and focus group discussions
Preparation in anticipation of the pandemic Communication within the ICU Team and with the organisation and the department of health at a state level
Information and education received by ICU staff during or prior to COVID
Responding to changes to clinical practice at a unit (ICU) level
Responding to patient needs at the coalface in the ICU and clinical leadership
Management of substitute decision makers in the ICU including the issues around end-of-life, in the context of restricted visitation

All IDIs and FGDs, with permission from the participants, were recorded using an audio software on smartphones and transcribed verbatim for analysis. The participants were provided with the transcripts and the opportunity to clarify responses before analysis. No participant withdrew from the study.

Data analysis

We used an archive (Box®, a web-based document-sharing platform with password protection) to store the transcribed versions of the audio-recorded interviews, which facilitated sharing information between investigators and the subsequent analysis. Thematic analysis, according to the 'framework approach' described by Spencer and Ritchie et al. [19] and adopted by Strickland and Hackett [20], was employed. The data analytics using the above-mentioned approach was led by the first author and the data analysis scheme* is illustrated in Figure 1

(Insert Figure 1 here)

Fidelity

We addressed the study's trustworthiness by enhancing its internal and external validity and its credibility, transferability, and reliability. To enhance credibility, we used a well-validated research methodology (qualitative descriptive) [21-22] and combination of methods (IDIs and FGDs) based on purposeful sampling, using an interview guide that used probes to facilitate the IDIs and FGDs

All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed professionally with ethics approval; this approach generated high-quality transcripts that included direct quotations in 18 datasets (16 individual interviews and two focus groups).

From these datasets, we identified similarities in the codes, themes, and sub-themes, thereby ensuring the data's veracity. The participants concurred that the results reflected their true viewpoints, thus strengthening our study's internal validity and rigour. The coding was initially done by the principal investigator, which was overseen by the last author. The coding undertaken by the manual process was crosschecked with the coding obtained from the Nvivo 12 software to enhance the authenticity of the codes and the reliability of the study.

For generalisability, we have outlined the research settings and the participants i.e., a quaternary referral ICU at a university teaching hospital with trained critical-care nurses and accredited doctors under the auspices of the College of Intensive Care Medicine of Australia and New Zealand, as the finding might strike a chord with similar centres across the world.

RESULTS

Thirty-two participants took part in sixteen IDIs and two FGDs (eight participants in each group). As data saturation was achieved and no new barriers and enablers were identified, after sixteen IDIs and two FGDs; no further interviews were undertaken.

For the IDIs (n=16), participants comprised seven (44%) women and nine (56%) men, which included eight (50%) intensivists and eight (50%) critical care trained nurses. For the FGDs (n=16), ten (63%) women and six (37%) men who were not involved in the interviews participated, which included eight (50%) intensivists and eight (50%) critical care trained nurses. All participants were involved in direct care of COVID-19 patients. The demographic data has been summarised in Figure 2.

(Insert Figure 2 here)

The interview guide for the in-depth interviews and the moderator guide for the focus group discussions have been added to the supplemental file. We identified six themes and twenty-four sub-themes concerning the preparedness for, and responses to, COVID-19. The themes and sub-themes are summarised in Table 2.

(Insert Table 2 here)

Table 2: Themes, Sub-themes, and exemplar quotes written verbatim from the clinicians illustrating the enablers and barriers

Themes	Subthemes	Exemplar quotes
Staff competence and planning	a. Knowledge	<i>I do not know whether we could have been more prepared (IDI 5) Communication was two-way between us and the central command. We were regularly updated on what was important and speaking to some of my colleagues especially interstate I felt that we were a lot more prepared than elsewhere..... (FGD 2)</i>
	b. Lead-in time	<i>I remember there was something like 2 or 3 weeks where it was quiet but that was the lead-in time for our preparation, we were just waiting for it to happen (IDI 9)</i>
	c. Dissemination	<i>We had created a system (i.e., policies, protocols, and guidelines) that were going to be able to look after the patients from the moment that they came in until through and through to discharge and this was sent to all and sundry (IDI 15) Two- way transfer/transaction between us and the central command centre was an enabler in overall planning and preparedness and helped overcome the barriers with the silos that existed (IDI 1) and FGD 2</i>
Information transfer, and communication	a. Communication	<i>Communication was always brilliant. (IDI 15) While we had protocols and policies around that time, in terms of my personal safety and of my family, I had some concerns and on reflection, it would have been better to have had some clearer guidance and communication (IDI 3).</i>
	b. Information overload	<i>There was just too much information being sent to people, some irrelevant, so we got tired of it, and I stopped reading it after a while. (IDI 12)</i>
	c. Stakeholder engagement	<i>Engaging with our stakeholders through the clinical advisory group and clinical operations was immensely helpful. (IDI 11)</i>
Education and skills for the safe use of PPE	a. Donning and Doffing	<i>Overall, our efforts [donning and doffing sessions] with infection control were outstanding (IDI 8)</i>
	b. Simulation	<i>The simulation sessions were brilliant. (IDI 16).</i>
	c. Clarity and Certainty	<i>There were a lot on the news in the public media about PPE and that was hard to know for sure whether that was going to be, OK? There was not 100% clarity (IDI 4)</i>

		<i>There was often a lot of confusion about what masks we were wearing. I think from the other teams as well, they reflected that uncertainty and fear. (FGD 2)</i>
Team dynamics and clinical practice	a. Cluster care	<i>While caring for COVID patient, you prepare a lot, you prepare a lot more. Clustering care minimises redundancy (IDI 15)</i>
	b. Resilience	<i>We all had that opportunity to say, well, you did an exceptionally good job in that role, but if you could do this a little bit better? (IDI 16)</i>
	c. Attitudes	<i>COVID crisis gave us the best opportunity for everybody to know, what sort of a guilt-free or judgment-free zone, we operate in this unit, and to be able to say, "I am scared" (IDI 15)</i>
Leadership	a. Accountability and Transparency	<i>I am not only proud of the way the ICU leadership handled the situation but how transparent they were. (IDI 15)</i>
	b. Peer-support and participatory governance	<i>I think we need to look after each other, I think that there are a lot of emotions and stress, so I think that looking after each other and watching out for each other is crucial. (IDI 8)</i> <i>I felt it was a great example of leadership to create a consequence-free zone, so that people could talk about the things that were upsetting or concerning them, and all of us feel involved and participate in finding solutions for common problems. (IDI 16)</i>
	c. Collapsible hierarchy	<i>I think having a level playing field, a flat hierarchy that is collapsible helped, it had everyone on an even keel (FGD 2)</i>
	d. Psychological safety	<i>I was able to express my concerns and the ICU leadership organised the clinical psychologist to come and talk to us, that was more towards the end or even after the experience, but that was still very helpful (FGD 2)</i>
Managing End-of life situations and expectations of caregivers	a. Technology	<i>Telehealth is a good way of communicating with the relatives and that should be used lot more, Tablets and the iPads as a channel of communication should be used more (IDI 2)</i>
	b. Restricted Visitation policy	<i>Very difficult for families, all the families that I interacted with through that time were incredibly understanding. I do not recall that week, any family really being upset or angry. They all seemed to understand the circumstances and accept, (IDI 3)</i>
	c. Empathy and compassion	<i>I think our primary goal is the good of the community and people must live with the knowledge that their loved one could die without anyone being present and a further knowledge of people that you know you and I could die without any of our loved ones being present next to us (IDI 13)</i>

1 **Staff competence and planning**

2

3 This theme describes the contrary perspectives of ICU nurses and doctors on staff
4 competence and planning. The concept of competency includes both the knowledge
5 (what to do) and the skills (how to do it) necessary to be prepared and respond
6 effectively and efficiently to COVID-19.

7 ***“I felt like the ICU team were well prepared and that goes to all the different***
8 ***aspects of the preparation.” (IDI 4)***

9 ***“The amount of work that was done in a very short span of time was***
10 ***commendable” (IDI 9)***

11 Some healthcare providers compared what was happening at the national level and
12 opined that the organisation was better prepared compared with other centres within
13 Australia. The lead-in time (i.e., the time lag between the COVID-19 outbreak
14 overseas, and the subsequent arrival of the cruise ships on Australian shores) was
15 identified as a stroke of good fortune by most participants ($n = 12$, 75%).

16 ***“It did not seem like we pushed hard until COVID in Italy exploded, we picked***
17 ***up after Italy and it was then we put the foot on the accelerator” (IDI 9)***

18 Planning and lead-in time were also key factors that influenced the ability to provide
19 staff with knowledge and access to important information about the protocols,
20 policies, and guidelines pertinent to the management of COVID-19.

21 There was general agreement among the participants that the most recent and
22 updated version of the policies, protocols and guidelines concerning the
23 management of patients with COVID-19 were easily available. Perceived barriers in

24 the planning phase were related to the silos that existed with different levels of
25 procurement of equipment. However, the command-and-control structure was
26 recognised as an enabler in overcoming those barriers.

27 ***You suddenly find out all the things (i.e., PPE) that are not produced locally,***
28 ***and we had to procure them at short notice. (IDI 5)***

29

30 **Information transfer, and communication**

31

32 Participants expressed divergent views on the quality and quantity of
33 communication, the nature of the transfer of information and, more importantly, the
34 ‘dose’ of information, as information overload emerged as one of the themes. The
35 perceived shortcomings in terms of inconsistency of communication were a source of
36 healthcare providers’ frustrations. Quality refers to the attributes of timely
37 communication of evidence-based information, while quantity describes the volume
38 of evidence-based data.

39 On the other hand, communication between doctors and nurses (horizontal
40 information flow) and between the command-and-control structure and the frontline
41 workers (vertical information flow) was optimal in dose (quantity) at several stages of
42 preparation and response. The command-and-control structure used an incident
43 management framework [23] that linked the executive medical administration, heads
44 of units and divisional leads to the various clinical programs (i.e., specialities) of the
45 hospital (i.e., command) and the health department at the state level (i.e., control).
46 This framework also integrated various aspects of intelligence gathering, planning,
47 operations, logistics, public information, investigations, and recovery. Innovative use

48 of technology, such as web-based document-sharing platform (Dropbox®), for
49 instant sharing of information; WhatsApp notifications for urgent issues; and Zoom
50 meetings for virtual conferences, meant that it was easy to access information
51 throughout the day.

52 ***“I think our consultant group were very supportive of the nursing team and
53 were approachable. Had no problems in communication “(IDI16)***

54 A few participants made the distinction between information and fact. Further,
55 sharing value sets (collegiality and patient centeredness) and vulnerabilities
56 (acknowledging our fears) was recognised as a vital element of having meaningful
57 and deep engagement with key stakeholders. Our key stakeholders involved the
58 medical personnel from the emergency department, infectious diseases, general
59 medicine, anaesthesia, surgical specialties, and the nursing & allied health staff from
60 the above-mentioned craft groups.

61 ***“And there was a lot of information and not much fact.... (IDI 7)***

62

63 **Education and skills for the safe use of PPE**

64

65 The sub-themes revolved around donning-and-doffing sessions, educational lessons
66 on the safe use of PPE and simulation exercises, including mock drills on critical
67 scenarios. Participants were unanimous in acknowledging the utility and validity of
68 the simulation sessions, which were very helpful, not just at an individual level in
69 terms of improving their skills, confidence, and competence but also at a unit level by
70 improving the quality of clinical service delivery, throughput and operational
71 efficiency and effectiveness.

72 ***“I think that simulation has really helped me in terms of practising life***
73 ***sustaining skills and then applying them in practice. (IDI 8)***

74

75 **Team dynamics and clinical practice**

76

77 ‘Cluster care’ is the mechanism by which multiple patient-focused tasks are
78 integrated and doctors and nurses collaborate to minimise interruptions to the time
79 spent by nurses in patient cubicles; this may involve delegating tasks to doctors,
80 which otherwise would not have occurred, the importance of cluster care and team
81 dynamics came to light during both in-depth interviews and focus groups.

82 Simultaneously, the respondents acknowledged that, while having agreement on
83 policies, protocols and guidelines, minimised unwarranted clinical-practice variation,
84 the risk of such variation was not nullified completely. Teamwork and cohesiveness
85 were essential drivers in mitigating unwarranted clinical-practice variation. Cluster
86 care emerged as a new phenomenon and is likely to be used more frequently
87 because it was perceived by the informants as an effective and efficient mechanism
88 of addressing redundancy and non-value-added work.

89 ***Clustering care is the way forward as it is efficient and effective (FGD 2)***

90 ***Consistency, cohesiveness, transparency, and teamwork with a pipeline to***
91 ***escalate issues would help minimise clinical practice variation (FGD 2)***

92

93

94 **Leadership**

95

96 The participants were unanimous in their views that the leadership was decisive and
97 accountable during pandemic management. However, respondents did highlight
98 some inconsistencies and incongruence in delivering unambiguous take-home
99 messages that, in hindsight, stemmed from the difficulties in reconciling information
100 from various sources. A flat or collapsible hierarchy, at the unit where this study was
101 conducted, that emboldens the tenets of good corporate citizenry, peer support and
102 psychological safety was highlighted as one of the critical enablers. The participants
103 had divergent views of the lines of communication in terms of who was responsible,
104 who was accountable, who was to be consulted and who was to be informed, and it
105 was suggested by the respondents that one of the lessons from this experience
106 would be to streamline the lines of reporting and escalation pathways.

107 ***I thought that certainly from a hospital level, the leadership at a clinical and***
108 ***managerial level was strong and sensible and more importantly visible and***
109 ***accountable (FGD 2)***

110

111 **Managing end-of-life situations and expectations of caregivers**

112

113 All participants were of the view that managing the end-of-life situation in COVID-19
114 patients was the most challenging experience in their professional lives. The group
115 was unanimous that technology was beneficial. Had it not been for video-calling
116 devices (i.e., iPads/tablets), communicating with families would have been
117 impossible, and the situation would have been a lot more traumatic for all concerned.

118 ***I think for the families whilst distressing on one hand to see how their loved***
119 ***one is going; it is kind of comforting as well to know that there is somebody***
120 ***with them. (IDI 12)***

121

122 **DISCUSSION**

123

124 This is the first study conducted to explore the perspectives, opinions and
125 proficiencies of staff managing critically ill patients in an ICU of a hospital designated
126 for managing COVID-19 in Australia. It addresses the knowledge gap in how
127 frontline clinicians adapt to these circumstances. This study identified more
128 facilitators than impediments in providing care to those patients. Findings inform that
129 with effective communication and teamwork it is possible to provide effective care to
130 patients and support for staff despite the huge challenges posed by a pandemic. The
131 facilitators were identified in the creative use of technology in galvanising the
132 workforce, dealing with difficult family situations, and engaging with families. Use of
133 simulation technology was also a primary facilitator, as were shared values among
134 colleagues and a spirit of collegiality, which helped practitioners to prevail over the
135 barriers. The barriers revolved around information overload and inconsistent
136 messaging. The lack of clarity on PPE use and its perceived non-availability point to
137 concerns with pandemic preparedness and the distribution of vital resources to those
138 on the frontlines.

139

140

141 Overall, the clinician's perspectives on staff competence and planning were
142 favourable, notwithstanding the divergence in opinions regarding planning at various
143 stages of the pandemic. While it may be tempting to attribute the competence and
144 planning to overall preparedness, the importance of the lead-in time before the first
145 wave hit the Australian health system cannot be overstated.

146 The lead in time allowed the organisational machinery to build capacity, marshal
147 resources and, more importantly, allow people to get into the right headspace to
148 stand and deliver. As noted by the previous research [24], we also found that the
149 leadership in this unit facilitated trust and empowerment and that contributed to
150 hospital's readiness and resilience the teamwork and stakeholder engagement were
151 an enabler in planning and execution. This finding is consistent with the evidence
152 that organisations that believe in a 'people first' policy foster resilient healthcare [25]
153 and have better outcomes and performance. Technology and health informatics [26]
154 were enablers in disseminating information and keeping staff members updated on
155 current guidelines. There was good uptake using the Dropbox platform, video
156 conferencing and virtual meeting facilities and tele-counselling to provide emotional
157 support to caregivers of patients with COVID-19. This finding mirrors those of other
158 studies [26,27] that have identified technology as a valuable resource in crisis
159 management and in reorganising clinical workflows to make them more efficient and
160 robust.

161 Information overload was one of the main concerns that emerged from this study.
162 This resonates with the experiences of other frontline workers across the globe [28].
163 Information asymmetry and discordance were the other parallel themes which aligns
164 with the issues highlighted by other organisations in similar situations [29]. The
165 COVID-19 pandemic has also been described as the 'infodemic' [29]. Technology

166 cuts both ways; however, while the appropriate use of technology can make it easier
167 to share useful information, the unintended consequence of attempting to share
168 information quickly is the perception of mixed messaging when specifics crystallise
169 over time.

170 An important finding relates to skill-enhancement methods, highlighted by the
171 respondents' concern with the education and skills needed to use PPE. The
172 donning-and-doffing sessions [30] and simulation exercises (mock drills) [31]
173 provided the clinicians with real-life experience; the practice was unanimously
174 labelled as a very valuable exercise. These findings mirror the emerging body of
175 literature [30,31] on the pandemic. PPE has been a pivotal issue [32] in this
176 pandemic owing to several concerns; for the first time in recent memory, clinicians
177 were stressed about the risk not only of asymptomatic transmission [33] of the virus,
178 but also of the impact, inadequate or suboptimal PPE could have on their patients,
179 close family members [34] and the community. Numerous healthcare workers have
180 either acquired the disease, suffered moral distress and burnout, or died in the line of
181 duty.[35] Participants expressed a view that, while efforts to mobilise resources,
182 undertake fit-testing and communicate effectively was better than at most
183 centres,[36] the clarity of information and efficiency in sharing intelligence concerning
184 PPE was lacking, the National COVID-19 Clinical Evidence Taskforce only recently
185 have been provided with resources to provide independent evidence based
186 guidelines on various PPE to support frontline workers and this was identified as an
187 opportunity for improvement.

188 Work dynamics, team culture and peer support emerged as central themes. The
189 core of them was resilience. According to our participants, the combination of having
190 foresight on how the pandemic would unravel, its implications on clinical practice,

191 and the need to modify workflows in response to contingencies. The other aspects of
192 resilience that were tested were the ability to cope under pressure, disallowing a bad
193 situation to escalate; and the tenacity to recover without suffering the consequences
194 of burnout. This experience was sentinel amongst the clinicians and mirrors the
195 emerging research on resilience in organisations.[37] Psychological support was
196 identified as an enabler, but the majority felt it was offered late in the process and
197 could have been considered earlier. [37,38] Resolute and decisive leadership is a
198 key requirement [39] for any strategic and operational direction in a pandemic. This
199 requirement emerged very strongly as a theme and was highlighted at various
200 stages, including at the team level in the ICU, at the organisational level and at the
201 state level. Contrary to the experience in other centres [40] where there has been a
202 significant lack of senior leadership presence at the coalface, participants in this
203 study witnessed strong and visible leadership among ICU medical and nursing staff
204 and at the organisational and state level. Having a strong peer-support model [41]
205 with a flat hierarchy was appreciated by many, which resonated across both nursing
206 and medical colleagues.

207 Finally, one of the significant constraints on the frontline clinicians was social
208 distancing and the need to be physically isolated if unwell. Restrictions on mobility
209 and gathering in public places created numerous problems in visitation hours in the
210 ICU and in managing end-of-life situations. This experience is like other centres [42]
211 that have dealt with managing critically ill patients with COVID-19. Resorting to
212 technology and using video-calling resources was helpful in this space, and the
213 lessons from this experience could be used even in non-COVID-19 situations,
214 particularly for families from rural and remote communities. However, standard
215 operating procedures based on established national guidelines [12] on end-of-life

216 care, which promote space and capacity for loved ones to spend time with a dying
217 family member, were not practised in this centre because of the highly contagious
218 nature of COVID-19 and the restrictions that were enforced; this resonates with the
219 experiences of other centres.[43]

220 The ICU staff resorted to utilising technology to assist with family conversations and
221 physical distancing requirements. Video conferences for family meetings added
222 another layer of complexity to management. We hope this endeavour and the
223 lessons learned will help physicians prepare to manage similar situations in the
224 future. Applying a multifaceted and multidisciplinary quality-improvement initiative
225 using the PDSA (plan, do, study, act) methodology [44] would help clinician
226 administrators and health policy managers consolidate the lessons from this study
227 and leverage the learnings for crisis/disaster management in the future. The systems
228 re-engineering model [45] focusses on the interaction between human factors,
229 resource constraints and complex health systems with competing demands in
230 managing crisis situations. While a detailed review of such interplay was outside the
231 scope of this study, the study provided insights into some of the human factors,
232 resource supply and use, and organisational factors. Further research on this
233 relationship may benefit from incorporating the system re-engineering model in crisis
234 management.

235

236

237

238

239

240 **CONCLUSION**

241

242 The overall impression of frontline clinicians towards the preparedness for, and
243 response to the COVID-19 pandemic in an ICU at this quaternary referral centre
244 under the governance of a crisis management framework was favourable, due
245 mainly to the enablers in ensuring wide stakeholder engagement, shared
246 responsibilities and single point accountability.

247 However, we have identified opportunities for improvement in the domains of having
248 foresight with planning and logistics (including self-sufficiency with equipment),
249 conducting oversight of operational and strategic activity, and developing insights
250 into communications and managing end-of-life care with compassion and with the
251 appropriate use of technology. The line of sight of the leadership could potentially be
252 optimised to provide opportunities to seek assistance and support when needed.

253

254 **Legends/Captions**

255

256

257

258 Figure 1 Data analysis scheme

259

260

261 Table 1 Structure for in-depth interviews and focus
262 group discussions

263

264

265 Figure 2 Demographic data on participants

266

267

268 Table 2 Themes, Sub-themes, and exemplar quotes
269 written verbatim from the clinicians

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285 **Contributorship statement**

286

287

288 KS was involved with the conceptualisation of the study, literature review, ethics

289 application, conduct of the study and investigation, methodology and writing the

290 original draft. PB was involved with the methodology, data analysis editing the

291 manuscript. AM was involved with the writing review. AP and BR were involved with

292 the ethics submission, methodology, data analysis and writing review. MAM was

293 involved with literature review, methodology, data analysis and editing the

294 manuscript.

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

309

310

311

312

313

314 **Competing Interests Statement**

315

316 The authors report no competing interests and the authors had

317

318 • No association with commercial entities that provided support for the work
319 reported in the submitted manuscript (the time frame for disclosure in this
320 section of the form is the lifespan of the work being reported).

321 • No association with commercial entities that could be viewed as having an
322 interest in the general area of the submitted manuscript (the time frame for
323 disclosure in this section is the 36 months before submission of the
324 manuscript).

325 • No similar financial associations involving their spouse or their children under
326 18 years of age.

327 • No Non-financial associations that may be relevant to the submitted
328 manuscript.

329

330

331

332 Krishnaswamy Sundararajan

333 Peng Bi

334 Adriana Milazzo

335 Benjamin Reddi

336 Alexis Poole

337 Mohammad Afzal Mahmood

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347 **Funding statement**

348

349

350 **This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the**
351 **public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors'**

352

353 Krishnaswamy Sundararajan

354 Peng Bi

355 Adriana Milazzo

356 Benjamin Reddi

357 Alexis Poole

358 Mohammad Afzal Mahmood

359

360

361

362

363

364

365

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378 **Data sharing statement**

379

380

381 Data has been stored with the University of Adelaide repository and will be provided
382 on request

383

384

385 **Ethics statement**

386

387 This study involves human participants and was approved by the Central Adelaide
388 Local Health Network (CALHN) Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC)

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

404

405

406

407

408

409 **References**


- 410 1. Burrell AJ, Pellegrini B, Salimi F, et al. Outcomes for patients with COVID-19
411 admitted to Australian intensive care units during the first four months of the
412 pandemic. *Med J Aust.* 2021 Jan;214(1):23-30.
- 413 2. Litton E, Bucci T, Chavan S, et al. Surge capacity of intensive care units in case of
414 acute increase in demand caused by COVID-19 in Australia. *Med J Aust.* 2020
415 Jun;212(10):463-467.
- 416 3. Cook TM, El-Boghdady K, McGuire B, McNarry AF, Patel A, Higgs A. Consensus
417 guidelines for managing the airway in patients with COVID-19: Guidelines from the
418 Difficult Airway Society, the Association of Anesthetists the Intensive Care Society,
419 the Faculty of Intensive Care Medicine, and the Royal College of Anesthetists.
420 *Anaesthesia.* 2020 Mar 27.
- 421 4. Warrillow S, Austin D, Cheung W, et al. ANZICS guiding principles for complex
422 decision making during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Crit Care Resusc.* 2020 22 (2): 98-
423 102
- 424 5. Australian Government Department of Health [internet]. Guidance on the use of
425 personal protective equipment (PPE) in hospitals during the COVID-19 outbreak.
426 Version 6 [cited 2020 Jun 19].
427 [https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/guidanceon-the-use-of-personal-](https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/guidanceon-the-use-of-personal-protectiveequipment-ppe-in-hospitals-duringthe-covid-19-outbreak)
428 [protectiveequipment-ppe-in-hospitals-duringthe-covid-19-outbreak](https://www.health.gov.au/resources/publications/guidanceon-the-use-of-personal-protectiveequipment-ppe-in-hospitals-duringthe-covid-19-outbreak)
- 429 6. Wunsch H, Linde-Zwirble W, Harrison D, Barnato A, Rowan K, Angus D. Use of
430 Intensive Care Service during Terminal Hospitalizations in England, and the United
431 States. *American Journal of Respiratory Critical Care Medicine* 2009; 180:875-880.
- 432 7. Izcovich A, Ragusa MA, Tortosa F, Lavena Marzio MA, Agnoletti C, Bengolea A,
433 Ceirano A, Espinosa F, Saavedra E, Sanguine V, Tassara A, Cid C, Catalano HN,
434 Agarwal A, Foroutan F, Rada G. Prognostic factors for severity and mortality in
435 patients infected with COVID-19: A systematic review. *PLoS One.* 2020 Nov
436 17;15(11): e0241955.
- 437 8. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, et al. Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel
438 coronavirus in Wuhan, China. *Lancet.* 2020; 395: 497-506
- 439 9. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, et al. Clinical characteristics of 138 hospitalised patients
440 with 2019 novel coronavirus-infected pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA.* 2020 Mar
441 17;323(11):1061-1069
- 442 10. Collopy BT, Williams J, Rodgers L, Campbell J, Jenner N, Andrews N. The
443 ACHS Care Evaluation Program: a decade of achievement. Australian Council on
444 Healthcare Standards. *J Qual Clin Pract.* 2000 Mar;20(1):36-41.
- 445 11. Bloomer MJ, Hutchinson AM, Botti M. End-of-life care in hospital: an audit of care
446 against Australian national guidelines. *Aust Health Rev.* 2019 Oct;43(5):578-584.
- 447 12. Australian and New Zealand Intensive Care Society. The ANZICS statement on
448 death and organ donation. Edition 4 Melbourne: ANZICS, 2019

- 449 [https://www.anzics.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/ANZICS-Statement-on-](https://www.anzics.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/ANZICS-Statement-on-Death-and-Organ-Donation-Edition-4.pdf)
450 [Death-and-Organ-Donation-Edition-4.pdf](https://www.anzics.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/ANZICS-Statement-on-Death-and-Organ-Donation-Edition-4.pdf)
- 451 13. Starks H, Trinidad SB. Choose your method: a comparison of phenomenology,
452 discourse analysis, and grounded theory. *Qual Health Res.* 2007 Dec;17(10):1372-
453 80.
- 454 14. Reeves S, Albert M, Kuper A, Hodges BD. Why use theories in qualitative
455 research? *BMJ.* 2008 Aug 7;337: a949.
- 456 15. Braun, V. & Clarke, V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative*
457 *Research in Psychology* 2006; 3(2), 77-101
- 458 16. Krueger, Richard A. *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (2nd
459 ed), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications 1994.
- 460 17. Neubauer, B.E., Witkop, C.T. & Varpio, L. How phenomenology can help us
461 learn from the experiences of others. *Perspect Med Educ* 2019 Apr 8(2), 90–97.
- 462 18. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, et al. Standards for reporting qualitative
463 research: a synthesis of recommendations. *Acad Med* 2014; 89:1245–51.
- 464 19. Spencer L, Ritchie J, Lewis J et al *Quality in Qualitative Evaluation: A Framework*
465 *for Assessing Research Evidence.* The Cabinet Office, London 2003.
- 466 20. Hackett A, Strickland K. Using the framework approach to analyse qualitative
467 data: a worked example. *Nurs Res.* 2019 Sep 21;26(2):8-13.
- 468 21. Tessema GA, Gomersall JS, Laurence CO, Mahmood MA. Healthcare providers'
469 perspectives on use of the national guideline for family planning services in Amhara
470 Region, Ethiopia: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open.* 2019 Feb 20;9(2): e023403.
- 471 22. Tsang JLY, Ross K, Miller F, et al. Qualitative descriptive study to explore
472 nurses' perceptions and experience on pain, agitation, and delirium management in
473 a community intensive care unit. *BMJ Open.* 2019 Apr 4;9(4): e024328.
- 474 23. sahealth.sa.gov.au [Internet]. Adelaide: South Australian Health; c2021 [cited
475 2021 Mar 23]. Public Health; [about 2 screens] Available
476 from: [https://www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/public+content/sa+health+int](https://www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/public+content/sa+health+internet/public+health/disaster+preparedness+and+resilience)
477 [ernet/public+health/disaster+preparedness+and+resilience](https://www.sahealth.sa.gov.au/wps/wcm/connect/public+content/sa+health+internet/public+health/disaster+preparedness+and+resilience)
- 478 24. Sujan, M.A.; Huang, H.; Biggerstaff, D. Trust and psychological safety as
479 facilitators of resilient health care. In *Working Across Boundaries*; CRC Press:
480 London, UK, 2019.
- 481 25. McCann, C.M.; Beddoe, E.; McCormick, et al. Resilience in the health
482 professions: A review of the literature. *Int. J. Well-Being* 2013, 3, 60–81.
- 483 26. Reeves JJ, Hollandsworth HM, Torriani FJ, et al. Rapid response to COVID-19:
484 health informatics support for outbreak management in an academic health system.
485 *J Am Med Inform Assoc.* 2020 Jun 1;27(6):853-859.

- 486 27. Rubulotta F, Soliman-Aboumarie H, Filbey K, et al. Technologies to Optimise the
487 Care of Severe COVID-19 Patients for Health Care Providers Challenged by Limited
488 Resources. *Anesth Analg*. 2020 Aug;131(2):351-364.
- 489 28.Zarocostas J. How to fight an infodemic. *Lancet* 2020; 395:676.
- 490 29.Rathore FA, Farooq F. Information Overload and Infodemic in the COVID-19
491 Pandemic. *J Pak Med Assoc*. 2020 May;70(Suppl 3) (5): S162-S165.
- 492 30. Díaz-Guio DA, Ricardo-Zapata A, Ospina-Velez J, et al. Cognitive load, and
493 performance of health care professionals in donning and doffing PPE before and
494 after a simulation-based educational intervention and its implications during the
495 COVID-19 pandemic for biosafety. *Inez Med*. 2020 Jun 1;28(suppl 1):111-117.
- 496 31.Yuriditsky E, Horowitz JM, Nair S, Kaufman BS. Simulation-based uptraining
497 improves provider comfort in the management of critically ill patients with COVID-19.
498 *J Crit Care*. 2020 Oct 3; 61:14-17.
- 499 32.Kleinpell R, Ferraro DM, Maves RC, et al. Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic
500 Measures: Reports from a National Survey of 9,120 ICU Clinicians. *Crit Care Med*.
501 2020 Oct;48(10): e846-e855.
- 502 33.Gandhi M, Yokoe DS, Havlir DV. Asymptomatic transmission, the Achilles' heel of
503 current strategies to control Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2020; 382:2158-60.
- 504 34.Lee SH, Juang YY, Su YJ, et al. Facing SARS: psychological impacts on SARS
505 team, nurses, and psychiatric services in a Taiwan general hospital. *Gen Hosp*
506 *Psychiatry*. Sep-Oct 2005; 27:352–358.
- 507 35.Fusaroli P, Balena S, Lisotti A. On the death of 100+ Italian doctors from
508 COVID-19. *Infection*. 2020 Oct;48(5):803-804.
- 509 36.Tabah A, Ramanan M, Laupland KB et al. PPE-SAFE contributors. Personal
510 protective equipment and intensive care unit healthcare worker safety in the COVID-
511 19 era (PPE-SAFE): An international survey. *J Crit Care*. 2020 Oct; 59:70-75.
- 512 37.Rangachari P, L Woods J. Preserving Organizational Resilience, Patient Safety,
513 and Staff Retention during COVID-19 Requires a Holistic Consideration of the
514 Psychological Safety of Healthcare Workers. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020
515 Jun 15;17(12):4267.
- 516 38.Albott CS, Wozniak JR, McGlinch BP, Wall MH, Gold BS, Vinogradov S. Battle
517 Buddies: Rapid Deployment of a Psychological Resilience Intervention for Health
518 Care Workers During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Anesth Analg*. 2020 Jul;131(1):43-54
- 519 39.Everly GS, Wu AW, Crumpsty-Fowler CJ, Dang D, Potash JB. Leadership
520 principles to decrease psychological casualties in COVID-19 and other disasters of
521 uncertainty. *Disaster Med Public Health Prep*. 2020 Oct 22:1-10
- 522 40.I am A Nurse in A Covid-19 Unit. My Hospital's Leaders Frighten Me More Than
523 the Virus. Available online: [https://www.statnews.com/2020/05/06/nurse-frightened-
524 hospital-administrators-more-than-covid-19/](https://www.statnews.com/2020/05/06/nurse-frightened-hospital-administrators-more-than-covid-19/) (accessed on 12 December 2020).

- 525 41. Adams JG, Walls RM. Supporting the Health Care Workforce During the COVID-
526 19 Global Epidemic. *JAMA*. 2020;323(15):1439–1440
- 527 42. Negro A, Mucci M, Beccaria P, et al. Introducing the Video call to facilitate the
528 communication between health care providers and families of patients in the
529 intensive care unit during COVID-19 pandemic. *Intensive Crit Care Nurs*. 2020 Oct;
530 60:102893.
- 531 43. Sasangohar F, Dhala A, Zheng F, Ahmadi N, Kash B, Masud F. Use of telecritical
532 care for family visitation to ICU during the COVID-19 pandemic: an interview study
533 and sentiment analysis. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2020 Oct 7: bmjqs-2020-011604.
- 534 44. Taylor MJ, McNicholas C, Nicolay C, Darzi A, Bell D, Reed JE. Systematic
535 review of the application of the plan-do-study-act method to improve quality in
536 healthcare. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2014 Apr;23(4):290-8.
- 537 45. Holden RJ, Carayon P, Gurses AP, Hoonakker P, Hundt AS, Ozok AA, Rivera-Rodriguez
538 AJ. SEIPS 2.0: a human factors framework for studying and improving the work of
539 healthcare professionals and patients. *Ergonomics*. 2013 Nov 1;56(11):1669-86.
540
- 541
- 542
- 543
- 544

Figure 1:



Type of interviews	Number of participants	Mean Critical Care experience (Years± SD)	Gender distribution	Mean duration of interviews (Minutes ± SD)
IDI	16	17.4±3.73	7 Women and 9 Men	36.4±7.41
FGD1 (Nurses)	8	20.3± 3.81	6 Women and 2 Men	72.0 ± 4.24
FGD2 (Doctors)	8	12.5± 3.33	4 Women and 4 Men	