medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.02.22277174; this version posted September 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Debriefing surgery: a systematic review

Emma Skegg[1], Canice McElroy[1], Mercedes Mudgway[1], James Hamill[1,2]

Institution

1. Starship Children's Hospital, Park Road, Grafton, Auckland, New Zealand

2. Department of Paediatrics, Child and Youth Health, the University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Keywords

Debriefing, Interprofessional teamwork, Operating room

Declaration

Emma Skegg and Mercedes Mudgway were funded by a Starship Foundation grant. Canice McElroy was funded by a University of Auckland Summer Studentship. The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.02.22277174; this version posted September 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Objectives: Debriefing has been pivotal in medical simulation training but its application to the real-world operating room environment has been challenging. We aimed to review the literature on routine surgical debriefing with specific reference to its implementation, barriers, and effectiveness.

Methods: Inclusion criteria were studies pertaining to debriefing in routine practice in the operating room. Excluded were studies on simulation and training. We searched the databases Google Scholar, CINAHL, Web of Science Core Collection, PsychINFO, Medline, Embase, and ProQuest Theses & Dissertations Global. The last search was performed in March 2022. Quality was assessed on a 21-point checklist adapted from a standard reporting guideline. Synthesis was descriptive.

Results: The search identified 19 papers. Publication date ranged from 2007 – 2022. Five studies involved a specific intervention. Methodology of studies included surveys, interviews, and analysis of administrative data. Quality scores ranged from 12 – 19 out of 21. On synthesis we identified four topics: explanations of how debriefing had been implemented; the learning dimensions of debriefing, both team learning and quality improvement at the organisational level; the effect of debriefing on patient safety or the organisation's culture; and the barriers to debriefing.

Conclusion: Debriefing is valuable for team learning, efficiency, patient safety, and psychological safety. Successful implementation programs were characterised by strong commitment from management and support by frontline workers. Integration with administrative quality and safety processes, and information feedback to frontline workers, are fundamental to successful debriefing programs.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.02.22277174; this version posted September 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Debriefing is a process for individuals to discuss teamwork in a constructive and supportive environment. It has been defined as a 'facilitated or guided reflection in the cycle of experiential learning' [1]. Debriefing originated in the military to help soldiers deal with the physiological consequences of combat [2]. The aviation and space industries adapted debriefing to facilitate learning after simulated or real flight missions [3]. Health educators adopted debriefing as part of the growing field of medical simulation [4].

Errors in medicine have been recognised as a problem for over half a century. In 1964, Schimmel found that iatrogenic injuries occurred in 20% of patients and that 20% of these were serious or fatal [5]. In 1995, Donchin et al. found that, in their intensive care unit, only 0.95% of activities lead to an error but with 179 activities per patient per day there were on average 1.75 errors per patient per day [6]. Medical is complex [7]. 'Active' errors (the effects of which are felt straight away) can almost always be linked to a series of small errors. Small or 'latent' errors have been described as 'accidents waiting to happen' [8]. An individual held responsible for an active error was therefore set up to fail by numerous latent errors in their operating environment [8]. Latent errors occur even during successful operations. Catchpole et al. developed a framework of threats and errors in the operating room [9]. Threats arose from the organisation (e.g., organisational culture), the patient (e.g., anatomical variations or physiological problems), from process, protocols, techniques, equipment, and resources. Errors were classified as those associated with knowledge, skill or expertise, and those associated with teamwork.

An advance in the quality and safety of surgery happened with the development of the World Health Organisation's Surgical Safety Checklist (SSC) [10]. The SSC is a communication tool used at time points in the surgical process and encourages the participation of the entire surgical team. Three key components of the SSC are the 'sign-in' before administration of anaesthetic, the 'time-out' prior to incision, and the 'sign-out' at the end of the case. Hayes et al. showed that the SSC significantly reduced morbidity and mortality in a variety of high, middle and low-income settings [11]. Other components of the SSC that were not formally investigated in the study published by Hayes et al. were the briefing, which occurs before operating list begins, and the debriefing at the end of a list.

Debriefing is a way to identify errors, improve performance, improve communication, and promote teamwork [12]. Operating room teams can be described as 'action teams' [13]. They undertake time-critical, high-stakes, active procedures. Operating room teams are made up of personnel from a variety of professions; thus, they are multidisciplinary action teams. High-level functioning of multidisciplinary action teams is challenging and critical. From a review of 20 years of literature, Salas et al. identified key characteristics of an effective team: leadership, mutual performance monitoring, backup behaviour, adaptability, team orientation, shared mental models, mutual trust, and closed-loop communication [14]. To achieve these, team members must feel safe about sharing observations and opinions with the rest of the team, that is, they require psychological safety [15]. Psychological safety is not only essential to team learning; it can help maintain mental health and prevent burnout [16]. It has been the experience of ourselves and others that debriefing improves psychological safety of the operating room team [17].

Given the central role that debriefing plays in teamwork, the experience in other industries and in medical simulation, and the important connection with psychological safety, debriefing should be performed routinely in surgery. This is not the case. In our experience, debriefing is challenging to do well and is inconsistently performed. We were interested to learn how to best instigate a debriefing program.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.02.22277174; this version posted September 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Therefore, the aim of this review was to synthesise the literature on routine surgical debriefing with specific reference to implementation, barriers, and the effectiveness of surgical debriefing, and to identify gaps in the literature that could indicate future research directions.

Methods

This review was registered on the Open Science Framework [18].

Eligibility criteria

Criteria for including a paper in this review were studies pertaining to debriefing in routine practice. Excluded were studies pertaining to medical simulation or education. No study design or language limits were imposed. No date limit was applied.

Information sources

We searched the databases Google Scholar, CINAHL, Web of Science Core Collection, PsychINFO, Medline, Embase, and ProQuest Theses & Dissertations Global. We performed snowballing and citation tracking by scanned the reference lists of included studies.

Search strategy

We used the following search teams in the database searches: debrief*, operating room*, operating theat*, surgical procedures and/or operative and/or operating rooms. For some searches, we added a title/abstract term: simulat*. To be indexed, studies needed to mention at least one term related to each key variable: debrief and operating. The last date of searching was 14 March 2022.

Study records

Literature search results were exported from each electronic database then imported into Rayyan [19]. MM removed duplicates. Two reviewers (MM and ES) independently screened titles and abstracts and removed any studies clearly not meeting inclusion criteria. Blinding was then turned off to deal with discrepancies which were resolved at a meeting with a third reviewer (JH). When the list of potentially included results was agreed, reviewers obtained the full-text reports. The same two reviewers independently reviewed the full texts for inclusion and resolved discrepancies at a meeting involving the same third reviewer.

Data items

Data were extracted on methodology, how debriefing was implemented, the description of when and how debriefing was performed, any interventions, and outcomes. JH extracted data and MM checked data for accuracy.

Quality assessment methods

Quality assessment was by use of a customised checklist adapted from the Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research guidelines [20]. Papers were scored on 21 items including the quality of their title, abstract, problem formulation, purpose, research paradigm, reflexivity of the researchers, context/setting, sampling, ethics, data collection methods, data collection instruments, units of study, data processing, data

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.02.22277174; this version posted September 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

analysis, techniques to enhance trustworthiness, interpretation, links to empirical data, integration with prior work, discussion of limitations, and declarations of conflict of interest and funding. Items were scored as 1 or 0 for adequate or inadequate respectively.

Results

Description of studies

The search process resulted in 19 papers, as shown in the PRISMA flow diagram, Figure 1. The characteristics of each included paper are presented in Table 1. Publication dates ranged from 2003 – 2022 with the majority (15 of 19) published in the last 10 years.

Most studies (n = 15) referred to debriefing as a form of 'sign-out' checklist rather than a dedicated team discussion at the end of an operating session. One study involved the orthopaedic departments of two hospitals in which one unit debriefed after every case and the other unit debriefed at the end of the operating list [21]. Seven studies involved an intervention: implementation of a debriefing (and briefing) process in five [13,17,22–24] and a coaching intervention to improve the quality of debriefs in three [25–27].

Assessment of quality

The mean quality score was 15/21 (standard deviation 2.1, range 12 – 19). All studies met criteria for title (100%), abstract (100%), problem formulation (100%), purpose or research question (100%), context (100%), data collection methods (100%), data collection instruments and technologies (100%), synthesis and interpretation (100%), and integration with prior work, implications, transferability, and contribution(s) to the field (100%). Few reported the qualitative approach or research paradigm (37%), ethical issues pertaining to human subjects (47%), or the process by which themes were developed (32%). No paper reported researcher characteristics/reflexivity or techniques to enhance trustworthiness. Quality assessments for each paper are presented in Table S1 in supplementary material.

Synthesis

For descriptive analysis we grouped papers into four broad topics: 1) explanations of how debriefing had been implemented including how coaching had helped to improve the quantity and quality of debriefing; 2) the learning dimensions of debriefing, both team learning and quality improvement at the organisational level; 3) the effect of debriefing on patient safety or the organisation's culture; and 4) the barriers to debriefing.

1. Implementation of debriefing

Implementation programs were of two types: top-down, where hospital clinicians and administration worked together to bring in a briefing/debriefing practice; and grassroots, where clinicians and researchers developed a debriefing practice in their workplace.

Top-down implementation programs were characterised by management taking active leadership in developing meaningful links to quality improvement processes and involving surgical and nursing staff. Rose and Rose describe this as a 'multilevel, multipronged' approach [24].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.02.22277174; this version posted September 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

An example of successful top-down implementation was McLeod Regional Medical Center, where the team involved 'stakeholders at every organisational level in crafting and implementing solutions', fed back all their findings to staff, executive leadership and the governing board, and 'set accountability for management to analyse events, follow up on findings, and drive change' [24]. They attribute their success to executive staff being physically present in the operating room, a culture of safety, a 'just culture' that focused on empowering nurses and encouraging open communication, 'levelling the playing field', and providing caregivers with early and meaningful feedback on the issues they had raised, the latter being regarded as the cornerstone to successful debriefing [28].

An example of top-down implementation that eventually failed was Beaumont Hospital, Michigan. They assembled a multidisciplinary team of frontline theatre staff, administrators, and hospital leadership, to launch a briefing/debriefing program across a range of surgical specialties [29,30]. The authors emphasised the importance of buy-in from clinicians and they emphasised the need for caregivers to see the value of a tool before they will use it [29]. After a change in executive leadership, the system collapsed. Their leadership removed their quality and safety nurse who facilitated dealing with the issues raised in debriefs and providing feedback to caregivers. They changed from a 'hands on' to an 'arms-length' approach. Loss of feedback was seen as the key aspect that led to the program's demise [28].

Grassroots implementation programs were characterised by clinician and researcher leadership. Bethune et al. described a less successful experience of grassroots implementation. The authors encouraged staff to together after theatre lists to debrief. No mention is made of a multidisciplinary consultatory process. They found that it was difficult to gather staff together after lists due to lack of buy-in from senior staff [31]. Mundt et al. set up debriefings in two hospitals led by trained facilitators. The authors mentioned close collaboration with heads of department but no system to link debrief outcomes with quality improvement. Participants cited problems with the feasibility of performing debriefs [21]. Papaspyros et al. reported recurring issues coming up in debriefs that were not resolved despite following standard hospital reporting procedures [32].

Together, these studies show that successful implementation requires debriefing to be resourced, integrated at all levels from grassroots to executive, and integrated with quality processes.

Coaching and audit

Three papers described how debriefing improved with coaching. In one study, a retired surgeon debriefed staff on the quality of their debriefs, as well as conducting group discussions and presentations. The researchers found a significant improvement in the quality of debriefs after coaching [27]. In a second study, two coaches met with nurses and surgeons, either as a group or individually. The researchers found an increase in the number of debriefs performed and the completeness of debriefs after coaching. These authors emphasised auditing as an important part of their implementation project [26]. In a third study, the researchers gave surgeons structured feedback on the quality of their debriefs and provided one-on-one coaching for surgeons who were finding debriefing difficult. The number of debriefs performed and the completeness of debriefs increased after coaching [25].

Two further studies looked at external education or guidance in debriefing. Paull et al. ran teaching sessions for leaders who would implement a new briefing/debriefing practice in their own hospitals. The authors found that participants who engaged the most with the teaching process also had the most success with implementation [23]. Vashdi et al. engaged with debriefing experts from the Air Force to bring military briefing/debriefing methodology into the surgical units of a teaching hospital [13].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.02.22277174; this version posted September 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Together, these studies show that debriefing benefits from guidance, and that operating rooms need to demonstrate commitment to quality debriefing through ongoing coaching and support.

Team and institutional learning

One study took an in-depth look at team learning processes as they relate to debriefing [13]. The authors applied the brief/debrief practices of the Israeli Air Force to surgical units in a tertiary hospital, with special focus on team learning. Surgery was seen to have problems with an unhealthy approach to criticism, status-based relationships between professional groups that impaired communication, difficulties in scheduling meetings, and inhibitions arising from concerns about liability. The research team proposed mechanisms by which surgical teams could improve from one surgery to the next. These were: single-loop learning ('problems identified in the context of a debriefing for a surgery conducted at time T1 are translated into improvements in planned actions included in the preoperative briefing for surgeries to be conducted at time T2'); direct double-loop learning ('engage in the questioning of taken-for-granted procedures and the assumptions underlying them' and 'search for the common, system-level roots of recurring problems'); and indirect double-loop learning ('the effect of structured team reflexivity on quality-related surgical team outcomes will be mediated by the degree to which surgical team members share a common sense of the importance of inquiry, transparency, and accountability in their day-to-day team-based interactions') [13].

Several studies addressed the potential for debriefing to facilitate institutional learning through quality improvement processes [24,28,30,33,33]. In one study, clinical, finance and supply chain managers reviewed all problems identified by debriefs to determine root causes, recommend solutions, and allocate actions, analysis and review to management team members [24]. They measured time taken for improvements to reach stable performance. Interestingly, more than half of the problems identified in debriefs were of an institutional nature, for example, problems with workflow, room readiness, instruments, or the supply chain, indicating that surgical teams would be powerless to influence the majority of the issues identified in their debriefs if management were not active participants in the process. As the authors put it, 'large-scale improvement only became possible with the tight coordination and contribution of scores of people around the surgery event' [24]. Another study described weekly cross-team departmental meetings to review the previous week's debriefings, looking for patterns that might indicate the need for system-level change [13].

Together, these papers emphasise the importance of communicating back to the team the actions that had been undertaken as a result of their debriefs. Debriefing should aim to influence systems change as well as culture change.

The effects of debriefing on culture, safety, and efficiency

Several studies reported on the effects of debriefing on culture, quality and safety. Rose and Rose showed a significant reduction in post-operative mortality after the implementation of a debriefing program [24]. The authors emphasised the need for long-term thinking because improvements occur over a period of years. In two studies, debriefing improved efficiency as measured by a reduction in delay to theatre, increased utilisation, more accurate scheduling of operations [34], and reduced staff working hours per case [24].

Debriefing was shown to improve the climate of psychological safety in several studies. Leonard et al. found that debriefing helped theatre workers feel more comfortable with speaking up, and this applied particularly to circulating nurses, scrub technicians and anaesthetic advanced practice providers [34]. Scores on the Safety Attitudes Questionnaire [35] improved with debriefing in two studies [22,24]. Similarly,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.02.22277174; this version posted September 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

two studies showed significantly increased scores on the Team Climate Inventory [36] after a briefing/debriefing program was introduced [17,37].

Together, through both qualitative and quantitative methodology, these papers show that debriefing improved safety for patients and staff.

Barriers to debriefing

Power dynamics appeared to raise barriers to debriefing. In a survey of theatre staff, most nurses and technicians thought that the responsibility for creating a culture of safety was a shared responsibility; however, over one half of surgeons thought it was the surgeon's responsibility [35]. Nurses and technicians felt more strongly that debriefing helped to create a culture of speaking up compared to surgeons. This suggest that team orientation may be associated with more open communication; conversely, those who wish to maintain hierarchical power imbalances raise barrier communication and therefore a barrier to effective debriefing.

Time presented a challenge to debriefing [21,31,38]. Theatre staff reported timing difficulties with debriefing at the end of short cases, preferring to debrief at the end of the whole list [21]. Debriefing near the end of a procedure can present difficulties if surgeons need to concentrate on operating or anaesthetists need to concentrate on reversal of anaesthesia [39]. Debriefing between cases presented difficulties with getting people together again after dispersing after the case [21,31,38]. Sometimes, senior surgeons would have left the operation before the debrief, allowing more junior staff to finish [39].

Lack of buy-in, little perceiving little benefit, thinking everything went well so there is nothing to debrief on, and not seeing debriefing as a priority [38].

A major barrier to debriefing was lack of action by management. Repeated, unresolved problems and thwarted efforts to improve processes undermine the credibility of the process and can be exhausting for staff [24]. This shows the need for 'top-down' leadership by managers to complement enthusiasm at the grassroots level.

Together, these papers show that team orientation and support at all levels facilitates debriefing while hierarchy, time pressure, lack of buy-in and inaction on issues raised represent barriers.

Discussion

This review shows that the literature on surgical debriefing is relatively sparse and not of high quality, but it does offer useful lessons on the how and why to debrief. The literature provides guidance on how to implement a debriefing program, useful data on the value of coaching in implementation and maintenance, valuable insights into team learning, clear lessons on the need to take a systems-wide view of quality and improvement, and preliminary data on the effect of debriefing on teams and on patient outcomes.

A collaborative effort between clinicians, management and quality services is needed for successful implementation of a debriefing program. The most successful programs had strong leadership from the hospital administration, good governance, and took time and commitment. It was interesting to contrast the examples of successful implementation with the unsuccessful, in which evidence of a collaborative

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.02.22277174; this version posted September 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

effort was lacking. The success of coaching in supporting debriefing programs was further evidence of the need for commitment by leadership.

The translation of a military briefing/debriefing practice into an operating room setting provided interesting insights into how much potential there is for team learning to improve in surgery, but also the challenges in the medical setting. Many of these challenges are deeply cultural in nature, such as the culture of hierarchy. To address barriers in order to bring about debriefing, and to address these *by* debriefing, would enhance patient care as well as work satisfaction for theatre personnel.

For teams to perform well they need to learn well. This is especially important in surgery where teams must adapt quickly in critical situations. The operating room environment provides a rich source of experience, but experience alone is not enough for effective learning [40]. Learning involves a cycle of concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract hypotheses, and active testing [41]. Learning occurs within learning spaces, not necessarily just physical spaces but also constructs in the social environment [41]. Given the potential for operating room teams to continually learn and improve, and it is surprising that team learning processes such as debriefing are not routine.

Briefing and debriefing were often addressed together in the papers in this review. Briefing is a team meeting that occurs at the beginning of an operation or operating list, while debriefing is a team discussion that occurs after the operation or operating list. From a learning perspective, both discussions go hand-in-hand; however, debriefing appears to be more difficult to enact than briefing. Barriers to debriefing included time pressures, not being able to get the whole team together after a case, and difficulties with buy-in from some staff. The timing problem may explain why some papers in this review located the debrief at the sign-out [39,42]. The sign-out is the third of the Surgical Safety Checklists and occurs during the completion of a case, usually after the count (which ensures all instruments and swabs are accounted for). The synonymous use to terms debriefing and sign-out could be confusing. In the present review, we hope to emphasise the value of a comprehensive team discussion, i.e., debriefing, over and above the previously established value of the sign-out checklist [11].

This review has several limitations. We used an adaptation of a reporting guideline for qualitative research assessing the quality of the papers included [20]. The methodology of included studies varied and although some included quantitative as well as qualitative data, outcomes were so variable that the application of standard quality assessment tools for systematic reviews was not feasible. We included studies that reported debriefing but, on review, were using the term ‘debrief’ as a synonym for the sign-out phase of the Surgical Safety Checklist; thus, we may have overestimated the number of relevant papers available. Many studies performed their debrief on a case-basis (i.e., after every operative case) and they were clearly on the spectrum as to how much of the debrief was a team discussion versus a checklist. Meta-analysis was not possible given the lack of data and variability of outcomes, limiting this to a descriptive review.

In conclusion, debriefing appears to be valuable for team learning, efficiency, patient safety and psychological safety. Surgical debriefing is challenging to implement and maintain. Successful programs are characterised by strong commitment from management in addition to support by frontline workers. Integration with administrative quality and safety processes and feedback to frontline workers are fundamental to a successful debriefing program. Overall, literature is lacking on the topic and more research on implementation, maintenance, and outcomes of surgical debriefing are required.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.02.22277174; this version posted September 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 1. Prisma flow diagram.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.02.22277174; this version posted September 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Papers included in the review.

Author	Year	Country	Case- or list	Methodology
Vashdi, *et al.*	2007	Israel	Unclear	Observational
Berenholtz, *et al.*	2009	USA	Case	Survey, interviews
Paull, *et al.*	2009	USA	Case	Intervention (teaching)
Papaspyros, *et al.*	2010	UK	Case	Interviews
Bethune, R. *et al.*	2011	UK	List	Survey, admin data
Bandari, *et al.*	2012	USA	Case	Survey
Porta, *et al.*	2013	USA	Case	Administration data
Kleiner, *et al.*	2014	USA	Case	Intervention (coaching)
Dharampal, *et al.*	2016	Canada	Case	Interviews
Bartz-Kurycki, *et al.*	2017	USA	Case	Observational
Leong, *et al.*	2017	Netherlands	List	Survey, questionnaire (TCI)
Magill, *et al.*	2017	USA	Case	Questionnaire (SAQ)
Brindle, *et al.*	2018	USA	Case	Interviews
Rose & Rose	2018	USA	Case	Questionnaire (SAQ), admin data
Finch, *et al.*	2019	USA	Case	Intervention (coaching)
Mundt, *et al.*	2020	Denmark	Both	Observational
Bui, *et al.*	2021	USA	Case	Intervention (coaching)
Schaap, *et al.*	2021	Netherlands	List	Questionnaire (TCI)
Leonard, *et al.*	2022	USA	Case	Survey

TCI, Team Climate Inventory. SAT, Safety Attitudes Questionnaire.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.02.22277174; this version posted September 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Fanning RM, Gaba DM. The Role of Debriefing in Simulation-Based Learning. Simul Healthc. 2007;2:115–25.

2. Adler AB, Castro CA, McGurk D. Time-Driven Battlemind Psychological Debriefing: A Group-Level Early Intervention in Combat. Mil Med. 2009;174:21–8.

3. Jenkins-Todd D, Kempton R, Miller B, Rogers DG, Bauer J, Dillon SF, et al. NASA's Space Flight Resource Management Program: A Successful Human Performance Error Management Program. SpaceOps 2002 Conf [Internet]. Houston, Texas: American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics; 2002 [cited 2022 Jun 5]. Available from: https://arc.aiaa.org/doi/10.2514/6.2002-T4-12

4. Raemer D, Anderson M, Cheng A, Fanning R, Nadkarni V, Savoldelli G. Research Regarding Debriefing as Part of the Learning Process. Simul Healthc. 2011;6:S52.

5. Schimmel EM. The Hazards of Hospitalization. Ann Intern Med. American College of Physicians; 1964;60:100–10.

6. Donchin Y, Gopher D, Olin M, Badihi Y, Biesky MR, Sprung CL, et al. A look into the nature and causes of human errors in the intensive care unit. Crit Care Med. 1995;23:294–300.

7. Gawande A. The Checklist Manifesto. How to Get Things Right. Henry Holt and Company.; 2010.

8. Leape L. Error in Medicine. JAMA. 1994;272:1851–7.

9. Catchpole KR, Giddings AEB, de Leval MR, Peek GJ, Godden PJ, Utley M, et al. Identification of systems failures in successful paediatric cardiac surgery. Ergonomics. 2006;49:567–88.

10. Martin IC, Mason M, Findlay G. A surgical safety checklist. N Engl J Med. 2009;360:2372–3; author reply 2374-5.

11. Haynes AB, Weiser TG, Berry WR, Lipsitz SR, Breizat A-HS, Dellinger EP, et al. A Surgical Safety Checklist to Reduce Morbidity and Mortality in a Global Population. N Engl J Med. Massachusetts Medical Society; 2009;360:491–9.

12. Zuckerman SL, France DJ, Green C, Leming-Lee S, Anders S, Mocco J. Surgical debriefing: a reliable roadmap to completing the patient safety cycle. Neurosurg Focus. American Association of Neurological Surgeons; 2012;33:E4.

13. Vashdi DR, Bamberger PA, Erez M. Can Surgical Teams Ever Learn? The Role of Coordination, Complexity, and Transitivity in Action Team Learning. Acad Manage J. Academy of Management; 2013;56:945–71.

14. Salas E, Sims D, Burke CS. Is there a "Big Five" in Teamwork? Small Group Res. 2005;36:555–99.

15. Edmondson A. Psychological Safety and Learning Behavior in Work Teams. Adm Sci Q. 1999;44:350–83.

16. Swendiman RA, Edmondson AC, Mahmoud NN. Burnout in Surgery Viewed Through the Lens of Psychological Safety. Ann Surg. 2019;269:234–5.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.02.22277174; this version posted September 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

17. Leong KBMSL, Hanskamp-Sebregts M, van der Wal RA, Wolff AP. Effects of perioperative briefing and debriefing on patient safety: a prospective intervention study. BMJ Open. 2017;7:e018367.

18. Mudgway M, Hamill J. Debriefing protocol. 2022; Available from: osf.io/r5zba

19. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. Syst Rev. 2016;5:210.

20. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research: A Synthesis of Recommendations. Acad Med. 2014;89:1245–51.

21. Mundt AS, Gjeraa K, Spanager L, Petersen SS, Dieckmann P, Ostergaard D. Okay, let's talk - short debriefings in the operating room. Heliyon. 2020;6:e04386.

22. Magill ST, Wang DD, Rutledge WC, Lau D, Berger MS, Sankaran S, et al. Changing Operating Room Culture: Implementation of a Postoperative Debrief and Improved Safety Culture. World Neurosurg. 2017;107:597–603.

23. Paull DE, Mazzia LM, Izu BS, Neily J, Mills PD, Bagian JP. Predictors of successful implementation of preoperative briefings and postoperative debriefings after medical team training. Am J Surg. 2009;198:675–8.

24. Rose MR, Rose KM. Use of a Surgical Debriefing Checklist to Achieve Higher Value Health Care. Am J Med Qual Off J Am Coll Med Qual. 2018;33:514–22.

25. Bui A.H., Shebeen M., Girdusky C., Leitman I.M. Structured Feedback Enhances Compliance with Operating Room Debriefs. J Surg Res. 2021;257:425–32.

26. Finch E.P., Langston M., Erickson D., Pereira K. Debriefing in the OR: A Quality Improvement Project. AORN J. 2019;109:336–44.

27. Kleiner C, Link T, Maynard MT, Halverson Carpenter K. Coaching to improve the quality of communication during briefings and debriefings. AORN J. 2014;100:358–68.

28. Brindle ME, Henrich N, Foster A, Marks S, Rose M, Welsh R, et al. Implementation of surgical debriefing programs in large health systems: an exploratory qualitative analysis. BMC Health Serv Res. 2018;18:210.

29. Berenholtz SM, Schumacher K, Hayanga AJ, Simon M, Goeschel C, Pronovost PJ, et al. Implementing standardized operating room briefings and debriefings at a large regional medical center. Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf. 2009;35:391–7.

30. Bandari J., Schumacher K., Simon M., Cameron D., Goeschel C.A., Holzmueller C.G., et al. Surfacing safety hazards using standardized operating room briefings and debriefings at a large regional medical center. Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf Jt Comm Resour. 2012;38:154–60.

31. Bethune R, Sasirekha G, Sahu A, Cawthorn S, Pullyblank A. Use of briefings and debriefings as a tool in improving team work, efficiency, and communication in the operating theatre. Postgrad Med J. 2011;87:331–4.

32. Papaspyros SC, Javangula KC, Adluri RKP, O'Regan DJ. Briefing and debriefing in the cardiac operating room. Analysis of impact on theatre team attitude and patient safety. Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg. 2010;10:43–7.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.02.22277174; this version posted September 1, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

33. Vashdi DR, Bamberger PA, Erez M, Weiss-Meilik A. Briefing-debriefing: using a reflexive organizational learning model from the military to enhance the performance of surgical teams. Hum Resour Manage. 2007;46:115–42.

34. Porta C.R., Foster A., Causey M.W., Cordier P., Ozbirn R., Bolt S., et al. Operating room efficiency improvement after implementation of a postoperative team assessment. J Surg Res. 2013;180:15–20.

35. Leonard LD, Shaw M, Moyer A, Tevis S, Schulick R, McIntyre RJ, et al. The surgical debrief: Just another checklist or an instrument to drive cultural change?. Am J Surg. 2022;223:120–5.

36. Sexton JB, Helmreich RL, Neilands TB, Rowan K, Vella K, Boyden J, et al. The Safety Attitudes Questionnaire: psychometric properties, benchmarking data, and emerging research. BMC Health Serv Res. 2006;6:44.

37. Anderson NR, West MA. Measuring climate for work group innovation: development and validation of the team climate inventory. J Organ Behav. 1998;19:235–58.

38. Schaap M, Hanskamp□Sebregts M, Merkx T (M AW), Heideveld□Chevalking A (A J), Meijerink J (W JHJ). Long□term effects of perioperative briefing and debriefing on team climate: A mixed□method evaluation study. Int J Clin Pr. 2021;75:1–10.

39. Dharampal N, Cameron C, Dixon E, Ghali W, Quan ML. Attitudes and beliefs about the surgical safety checklist: Just another tick box?. Can J Surg J Can Chir. 2016;59:268–75.

40. Mayer RE. Should There Be a Three-Strikes Rule Against Pure Discovery Learning? - PsycNET. Am Psychol. 2004;59:14.

41. Kolb AY, Kolb DA. Learning styles and learning spaces: A review of the multidisciplinary application of experiential learning theory in higher education. Learn Styles Learn Key Meet Account Demands Educ. Nova Science Publishers New York, NY; 2006. p. 45–91.

42. Bartz-Kurycki MA, Anderson KT, Abraham JE, Masada KM, Wang J, Kawaguchi AL, et al. Debriefing: the forgotten phase of the surgical safety checklist. J Surg Res. 2017;213:222–7.