

Implementing a program to improve handoffs and reduce adverse events in Paediatric Intensive Care Units in Argentina: a stepped wedge trial.

Authors: Jorro-Barón Facundo^{1,2}, Suarez-Anzorena Inés¹, Burgos-Pratx Rodrigo³, Demaio Noelia⁴, Penazzi Matias⁵, Rodriguez Gisela⁶, Rodriguez Ana Paula², Velardez Daniel⁴, Ábalos Silvina³, Lardone Silvina⁵, Olivieri Joaquín⁶, Gallagher Rocío⁴, Rodriguez Rocio¹, Gibbons Luz¹, Landry Luis Martin⁴, Garcia-Elorrio Ezequiel¹.

Affiliations:

1. Instituto de Efectividad Clínica y Sanitaria
2. Hospital General de Niños Pedro de Elizalde, PICU, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
3. Hospital Materno Infantil "Héctor Quintana" de Jujuy PICU, San Salvador de Jujuy, Jujuy, Argentina.
4. Hospital de Pediatría Prof Dr Juan P Garrahan, PICU, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
5. Hospital de Niños de San Justo, PICU, Prov. de Buenos Aires, La Matanza, Argentina.
6. Hospital de Niños Ricardo Gutierrez, PICU, Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

ABSTRACT

Introduction: An effective and standardized communication anticipates and limits the appearance of possible adverse events.

Objective: To evaluate the effect of the implementation of a handoff program in reducing the frequency of adverse events (AE) in Paediatric Intensive Care Units (PICUs).

Methods: Facility-based, cluster randomised stepped wedge trial in six Argentine PICUs, with more than 20 admissions per month. The intervention comprised a Spanish version on the I-PASS Handoff Bundle consisting of a written and verbal handoff using mnemonics, an introductory workshop with teamwork training, an advertising campaign, simulation exercises and observation and standardized feedback of handoffs.

Results: We recruited 6 cluster PICUs in 5 hospitals. We reviewed 1465 medical records (MR). We did not observed differences in the rates of preventable AE per 1000 days of hospitalization (control 60.4 [37.5 - 97.4] vs. intervention 60.4 [33.2 - 109.9], $p=0.3568$, RR:1.21 [CI95%:0.80 - 1.83]), and no changes in the categories or types of AE. We evaluated 847 handoffs. Compliance with all items in verbal and written handoff was significantly higher in the intervention group. We observed a longer time per patient to complete the handoff in the intervention group (7.29 minutes [5.77 - 8.81] vs. 5.96 [4.69 - 7.23]; $p < 0.0002$, RR:1.33 [CI95%:0.64 - 2.02]), without changes in the whole time used for handoff (control: 35.7 [29.6 - 41.8] vs. intervention: 34.7 [26.5

- 42.1]; $p = 0.4900$, RR:1.43 [CI95%:-2.63 - 5.49]). Perception of improved communication from provider didn't show changes.

Conclusions: After the implementation of the I-PASS bundle, improvement in the quality of handoffs was observed. Nevertheless, no differences were observed in the frequency of AE, nor in the perception of improved communication.

Key words: Quality improvement, Hand-off, Adverse events, epidemiology and detection, Critical care, Paediatrics.

Clinical Trials Registration Number: **NCT03924570**

Ethical approvals: the study was reviewed and approved by all the 5 hospitals Institutional Review Boards.

Corresponding author:

Facundo Jorro-Baron MD, MsC(c)

Researcher

Quality and Safety in Healthcare

Institute for Clinical Effectiveness and Health Policy

2024 Ravignani

(1414) Buenos Aires Argentina

+5491144000624

fjorro@iecs.org.ar

INTRODUCTION

In clinical settings, the effectiveness of communication is essential and must be considered as an interaction process(1). Communication errors represent the third cause of sentinel events(2), over half of which involve handoff failures(3). Handoff is defined as the exchange of information between health professionals about a patient, which is accompanied by a change in control or responsibility in the decisions of their care(4). It is estimated that a typical teaching hospital may experience more than 4,000 handoffs per day(5). The Joint Commission has established standardized transmission of information as a patient safety goal and advocates organizations to implement “a standardized approach to hand-off communications, including an opportunity to ask and respond to questions” (3).

Previous studies have shown that effective and standardized communication between caregivers in handoff is essential for patient safety, anticipates and limits possible errors(6–11). Different tools have been proposed as models to standardize the transmission of information during handoffs, many of them are acronyms to facilitate their use(12). The use of checklists was introduced to carry out handoffs between professionals in areas such as emergency rooms, wards, critical care units, and operating rooms. It was also shown that it not only contributes to reducing the length of handoffs, but also improves the quality of the information and the subsequent care of the patient(9). The implementation of an intervention including teamwork and a structured handoff has previously shown to decrease the number of adverse events (AE)(7).

The trigger tool methodology has proven useful in detecting AE. A tool called Global Assessment of Paediatric Patient Safety (GAPPS) has been described in the paediatric population, which proved to be reliable in measuring the incidence of AE(13). Trigger tools have shown that they can actively detect AE, through automated processes, at a higher rate than with the usual passive methods. Although GAPPS can be used to capture a wide variety of damage, these AEs are still discrete, easily quantifiable, and evident. However, children in the hospital setting are exposed to other more insidious harm. AEs produced by the delivery of unnecessary care may not be so easy to detect, because their effects may be subtle or may only be evident through long-term results (e.g. an unnecessary CT scan that triggers a leukaemia in the distant future (13,14).

There are only a few studies about handoffs quality and AE in low and middle-income countries, and none of them have rigorously evaluated the effectiveness of handoff-improvement programs. Stepped-wedge, cluster-randomised, controlled designs enabled both phased implementation and the use of established statistical approaches to compare control and intervention groups while minimizing the potential for bias and confounding(15).

We aimed to assess the effectiveness of a standardized handoff intervention to reduce the frequency of AE in Paediatric Intensive Care Units (PICUs) in a middle-income country.

METHODS

Study design

We conducted a facility-based, cluster randomized controlled trial with a stepped-wedge design in six PICUs between July 2018 and May 2019 (11 months). All participating units began as control practices without the trial intervention (three months). As the trial progressed, units were allocated randomly to receive the intervention in prespecified time periods (one month per step). This process continued until all participating clusters received the intervention. At the end of the study, all the clusters were exposed to the intervention for a period of at least 4 months.

Randomisation

The unit of randomisation was the PICU. Sites were assigned to one of five start dates by the study statistician via a computer-generated list of random numbers. Concealment of the intervention starting date was maintained up to fifteen days previous to launch the intervention at each PICU, because the preparatory activities were needed it. The flowchart of the allocated sequence and period is described in Supplementary Appendix 1.

Participants

The study was conducted in six PICUs of five public hospitals in three provinces of Argentina. Eligibility criteria for PICUs were the absence of a standardized handoff program in place and having at least 20 admissions per month.

Intervention

A formative research was conducted to identify barriers and facilitators for the implementation of the I-PASS handoff program in order to calibrate the intervention in each participant sites. Information was gathered from 17 senior level health care professionals from the participant PICUs through in-depth interviews.

For this study we implemented the Spanish I-PASS bundle used in previous studies in our setting(16,17), consisting of ten elements: 1) the I-PASS mnemonics (Illness severity, Patient summary, Action list, Situation awareness and contingency plans, Synthesis by the receiver) which served as an anchoring component for verbal and written information; 2) an introductory 2-hour workshop with key content about quality of handoffs and training in teamwork; 3) five tools of teamwork training of TeamSTEPPS program -an evidence-based program aimed at optimising performance among teams of health care professionals - : cross monitoring, brief, debrief, huddle and check-back) from(18); 4) a written handoff I-PASS based form; 5) a 1-hour simulation and role-

playing emphasizing the elements of the workshop; 6) a faculty development program; 7) a self-learning module to reinforce the components of the mnemonics; 8) direct-observation tools used by the faculty to provide feedback to physicians; 9) and an advertising campaign with printed material, posters and stickers with the IPASS logo and mnemonics for process and culture change; 10) a standardized I-PASS format written handoff template (6,7,19,20).

Each site also maintained an implementation log that was reviewed regularly to ensure adherence to each component of the handoff program. Biweekly meetings were held with each PICU to reinforce implementation strategies according to the difficulties presented and to ensure adherence to each component of the handoff program.

Measurement of study outcomes

Adverse events were the primary outcome. Two independent reviewers, following a structured methodology, assessed AE. Reviewers were trained in the GAPPS process. A primary reviewer (a PICU staff, not necessarily physician) evaluated the selected medical records (MR) using the GAPPS list of 37 possible manual triggers using the following order: a) evaluation of the discharge and progress notes, b) prescriptions, and c) nursing progress sheets. The triggers were clues that suggest a possible AE. When primary reviewers identify a trigger (e.g., naloxone administration), the MR was reviewed to determine whether an AE might have happened (e.g., hypopnea from opioid overdose resulting from a prescription error) or not (e.g., naloxone used to reverse a heroin overdose). The primary reviewers presented the suspicions of AE to the secondary reviewers (a PICU staff, physician), who independently evaluated whether an AE had occurred and its severity too. Following so, all of the reviewers reached a consensus in every AE with an initial disagreement (21). During the review of the MR, every AE without a prior trigger was identified and also reported in the study. Up to 30 MRs in each cluster per month were reviewed.

The secondary outcome was the compliance with items of adequate verbal and written handoff and was assessed by direct observation. All physicians were observed at least once per month presenting or receiving a handoff. The observer completed an evaluation form about the compliance with the elements of a good quality handoff (Supplementary Appendix III).

Physicians were surveyed about patient safety culture, emphasizing the communication dimension using Surveys on Patient Safety Culture (SOPS) from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (ARHQ) translated and validated in Spanish, previous and after the intervention was delivered(22).

Sample size

Sample size was estimated aiming to reduce the preventable AE (primary outcome) from 12% to 4.5%(17). Assuming an ICC of 0.01, a number of steps= 5, a cluster size per step=40, a power= 90% and an alpha Level= 5%, so the total number of clusters needed was six.

Data Management and Statistical Analysis

Data collectors were trained in GAPPS tool use and handoff observation, using specifically designed data forms.

Analyses were performed according to the intention-to-treat principle. To evaluate compliance with verbal and written IPASS, each PICU was used as the unit of analysis. The results collected from the observation forms were grouped into a dichotomous scale for statistical analysis considering adherence to quality elements described as: almost always, always; and non-adherence: sometimes, almost never, never. The percentage of each of the variables reported by the PICU was calculated according to the time of the intervention. The median and interquartile range (25% quartile - 75% quartile) were described in both control and intervention groups. The effect of the intervention was evaluated using the absolute difference of the median percentages and was tested using the Wilcoxon test corrected for continuity.

AE were calculated for every 1000 days of hospitalization. To estimate the effect of the intervention, a generalized mixed linear model was adjusted assuming a negative binomial distribution. The size effect was adjusted by time trend, including the variable of the month of the study as a fixed effect in the model. Estimated rates with their confidence interval were reported in the control group and in the intervention group. The measure of effect was estimated using the ratio of both rates (intervention / control).

For the analysis of the AHRQ Surveys on Patient Safety Culture, the Likert scale was dichotomized, and the items were interpreted as a positive answer to each question: agree and strongly agree; and as a negative answer: strongly disagree, disagree and neither agree nor disagree.

Descriptive statistics were used to report all of the variables of interest. The analysis was performed in R for Windows (The R Foundation).

RESULTS

During the study period, we reviewed 1465 MR with a total of 15842 PICU / patient days: 767 in the control period and 698 in the intervention period, in 6 different clusters (Figure 1). The MRs reviewed in each cluster and period are shown in the Supplementary Appendix II. We also observed 847 handoffs that yielded 5260 unique patient handoffs for evaluation. Patients' baseline characteristics were similar in the control and intervention groups (Table 1).

Table 1. Patient baseline characteristics.

	Control (N=767)	Intervention (N=698)
Age (months and SD)	52.9±58.9	58.2±59.8
Male sex (%)	58.9	56.4
Length of PICU stay (days and SD)	10.7±16.8	10.9±21.2
Paediatric Index of Mortality II score (mean and SD)	5.5 ±10.6	5.9±12.3
Mortality (%)	14.5	17.1
Destination on discharge - % (N)		
Home	4.0 (31)	4.9 (34)
Ward	76.1 (584)	78.9 (551)
Rehab centre	0.7 (5)	0.4 (3)
Other institution	3.7 (28)	3.3 (23)
Homecare	0.1 (1)	1.0 (7)
Dead	4.8 (37)	5.7 (40)
Other	9.7 (74)	4.6 (32)
Not registered	0.9 (7)	1.2 (8)

Adverse events

The rate of preventable AE per 1000 days of hospitalization was similar in both arms, 60.4 [37.5; 97.4] in the control group and 60.4 [33.2; 109.9] in the intervention group, $p = 0.3568$, difference 1.21 [95% CI: 0.80; 1.83]. No differences were observed in AE per 1000 days of hospitalization, nor in the damage produced by the AE, or type of AE in control versus intervention periods (Table 2). AEs occurred as a result of hospital-acquired infections, care related (no medications or procedures), medication related, related to procedures and related to diagnosis, with no differences between study periods. The detail of each AE collected were in the Supplementary Appendix 2.

Table 2. Effect of the intervention on the primary and secondary outcomes (measured per 1000 days of hospitalization)

	Rates for 1000 days of hospitalization (CI)		Rate of fees (Intervention/Control) (CI)	p-Value
	Control	Intervention		
Total Adverse Events	86.0 (60.0 - 123.3)	93.7 (57.9 - 151.6)	1.09 (0.84 - 1.42)	0.5217
Preventable Adverse Events	60.4 (37.5 - 97.4)	60.4 (33.2 - 109.9)	1.0 (0.74 - 1.34)	0.9982
Preventable AE with temporary damage to the patient with intervention requirement	18.8 (10.2 - 34.8)	17.8 (7.8 - 41.0)	0.95 (0.6 - 1.51)	0.8200
Preventable AE with temporary damage to the patient requiring admission to / prolongation of the hospitalization	26.0 (16.1 - 42.0)	20.2 (10.0 - 40.7)	0.78 (0.51 - 1.18)	0.2328

Preventable AE with permanent damage to the patient	1 event	5 events	-	-
Preventable AE which required intervention to maintain life	8.5 (2.8 - 26.2)	16.0 (3.5 - 72.4)	1.88 (0.82 - 4.31)	0.1365
Preventable AE with patient death	3 events	5 events	-	-
Medication related	10.4 (4.5 - 24.0)	10.8 (3.3 - 36.0)	1.04 (0.52 - 2.09)	0.9100
Related to procedures	9.7 (4.2 - 22.3)	7.7 (2.1 - 28.0)	0.79 (0.35 - 1.77)	0.5689
Care related (no medications or procedures)	11.7 (5.2 - 26.0)	9.9 (3.6 - 27.1)	0.85 (0.52 - 1.39)	0.5205
Related to diagnosis	1.6 (0.3 - 7.8)	5.4 (0.6 - 48.5)	3.39 (0.93 - 12.35)	0.0643
Hospital-acquired infections	20.9 (14.4 - 30.3)	19 (9.8 - 36.6)	0.91 (0.58 - 1.41)	0.6658
Falls	0 events	0 events	-	-
Others	0 events	0 events	-	-

Assessment of written and oral handoffs

The adherence to an adequate verbal and written handoff was measured in both periods (control and intervention), observing an increase in adherence in all the items after the application of the intervention (Fig. 2 & 3). The item “verbal handoff synthesis by the receiver” had the greatest adherence improvement, showing an increase from 1.3% to 87.6% in the intervention group, difference 86.3% (95% CI: 43.3 - 93.3), $p=0.0048$]. The item written handoff illness severity compliance had the best improve [control 0.7% (0.0; 1.6) vs intervention 94.5% (87.0 - 97.7); difference 93.7% (95% CI: 78.4 - 98.3), $p=0.0048$]. The key elements of the verbal and written handoff are shown in table 3.

Regarding the handoff duration, a longer time per patient was verified during the intervention period [control 5.96 minutes (4.69 - 7.23) vs intervention 7.29 minutes (5.77 - 8.81); difference 1.33 minutes (95% CI: 0.64 - 2.02), $p=0.0002$], with no difference in the time spend in the handoff as a whole in both periods [35.7 minutes (29.6 - 41.8) vs intervention 34.7 minutes (26.5 - 42.1); difference 1.43 minutes (95% CI: 2.63 - 5.49), $p=0.4900$].

Patient safety culture survey

Eighty-two subjects answered in the control period and 87 in the intervention period, being the response rate was greater than 80% in each of the clusters. There was no difference in the positive answers between periods (Table 4).

Table 4. Results of the patient safety survey during both periods.

Questions	Control	Intervention	<i>p</i>
1. Do people support each other in this unit?	78.0%	64.4%	0.045
2. When a lot of work has to be done quickly, do you work as a team to finish it?	90.2%	80.5%	0.872
3. In this unit, is staff personnel treated with respect?	68.3%	60.9%	0.342
4. When one area in this unit is really busy, others help you?	61.0%	60.9%	0.894
5. Is security never sacrificed even with a lot of work?	56.1%	51.7%	0.602
6. Are our procedures and systems effective in preventing errors that may occur?	47.6%	49.4%	0.795
7. Is it just by chance that more serious mistakes do not happen here?	20.7%	20.7%	1.000
8. Do we have problems with patient safety in this unit?	35.4%	32.2%	0.679
9. Does staff personnel speak freely if they see something that could negatively affect patient care?	68.3%	65.5%	0.680
10. Does staff feel free to question the decisions or actions of those with the most authority?	48.8%	42.5%	0.361
11. Are staff personnel afraid to ask questions when something do not seem right?	11.0%	6.9%	0.362
12. Is patient information lost when patients are transferred from one unit to another?	43.9%	34.5%	0.182
13. Is important patient care information often lost during shift changes?	41.5%	44.8%	0.600
14. Do problems often arise in the exchange of information through units of this hospital?	59.8%	49.4%	0.151
15. Are shift changes problematic for patients at this hospital?	36.6%	39.1%	0.789
16. Please give your area / work unit a general degree in patient safety (very good or excellent rating).	40.2%	34.5%	0.419

DISCUSSION

Summary of findings

In this randomised stepped wedge trial in PICUs of Argentina, we assessed the effect of a standardized handoff intervention to reduce the frequency of AE and increase the quality of handoffs. The intervention resulted in an overall improvement in the quality of verbal and written handoffs. However, the intervention did not significantly affect the frequency of adverse events. Improvements were observed in all the items considered needed for a handoff, but it was greater in the key elements, like illness severity and synthesis by the receiver. Patient summary ranked positively in both periods. The majority of the handoff quality items were far below 50% compliance before the intervention, and some of them reached more than 90% of adherence after the I-PASS bundle implementation. The intervention was deployed in similar ways in all the sites.

Strengths and limitations

This study had several strengths. We used a rigorous experimental design and achieved similar groups by using randomisation, which allowed the intervention to be evaluated effectively. The selected intervention components were previously documented as effective and were tailored

according to formative research. Finally, to our knowledge this is the first trial that evaluates the implementation of I-PASS bundle and also the use of a trigger tool in paediatric patients.

Nonetheless, the study had some limitations. It is already known that direct observation moved handoffs from 'backstage' to 'front-stage', and residents performed handoffs differently from their usual practice when they were observed (23). Secondly, the intervention was evaluated immediately after its implementation and in some PICUs it was implemented only for four months. Thirdly, the periods of the year did not coincide exactly in each cluster, and the passage of time in improving handoffs cannot be ruled out. Fourthly, the cluster size reached were lower than calculated, due to a drop in the number of admissions in participating PICUs between November 2018 and January 2019. Finally, the study was only carried out in PICUs in the public subsector of one Latin American middle-income country, which prevents us from extrapolating the results to other populations.

Interpretation

In this trial, the intervention did not significantly affect the total number of AE, the number of preventable AE, and the severity and categories of AE. Adverse Event rates are the product of numerous interacting institution structures and processes; and it is possible that variation in the ascertainment of error data or other unmeasured factors, were responsible for the lack of improvement in AE rates. We also found substantial inter-institutional variation in AE rates.

Regarding direct observation of health care providers, the majority of the observed staff personnel were physicians with many years of handoff experience, and we believe they were hardly influenced by being observed. Anyway, direct observation placed a spotlight on handoffs as a clinical skill, reinforcing the importance of doing it well.

Regarding the time used to carry out the handoff, no differences were observed with respect to the total time, and we observed a greater time spent per patient in the intervention stage. This difference could be due to the use of a new tool. Although a differential use of time towards other activities during the handoff cannot be ruled out, since the total time did not change in both periods. All the participating PICUs had paediatric residents or paediatric intensive care physicians in training, so the time of handoff was also used for teaching activities. This teaching activities often served to share mental model by providing the rationale for proposed management, which is an important feature of quality handoff (24,25). It has been suggested the I-PASS potential to reinforce an institutional culture that embraces interactive questioning and teaching opportunities with the goal of fostering shared understanding and optimizing patient care(26).

The AHRQ survey has been widely used in Spanish-speaking hospitals. None of the participating hospitals had previously used it in their PICUs. No changes were observed in the way physicians perceived patient safety related to the communication dimension, before and after implementing the intervention. One explanation may be the high baselines rates of patient safety and communication perception observed. The only one question with statistically significant difference was the one referred to mutual support. This item was not included in the teamwork training. The new situational awareness gained with the I-PASS bundle implementation could raise the necessity of more complete teamwork training.

Comparison with previous literature

There is a lack of robust evidence on best handoff practices, and current knowledge on the nature of handoff failures during inter shift transfers is scanty. Starmer et al. observed that after the implementation of the I-PASS, a similar improvement was observed in the compliance of the items related to a quality handoff, while no differences were observed in the load of resident's work. In this study, no changes were observed in the time used to transfer patients(7), and not all the sites reduced the AEs at the same level; also the compliance with the handoff key elements was heterogeneous. They observed a 23% relative reduction in medical errors and a 30% reduction in preventable AE. Decreased errors related to diagnosis, medical history and physical examination were observed. While they did not observe changes regarding errors related to medication, procedures or hospital infections (10). The AE report was based on direct observation or voluntary report. In our series, AEs were identified from MR, with a tool that, through pre-established triggers, can lead to AE, and also AE identified in the MR without triggers.

Shet et al. demonstrated that a process transfer supported by I-PASS was associated with better efficiency and culture of handoff safety(27). Coffey et al. in a study that showed experiences of residents with the implementation of the I-PASS package, they promoted the presence of other important active ingredients in this complex intervention, such as the automatic import of patient data in the electronic transfer document, improvements in the environment transfer, in teamwork and communication skills (12). They also noted that strict adherence may not be necessary to achieve the desired results. Like others, in our study, synthesis or re-reading was the most challenging feature of I-PASS for clinicians (10,13). The average compliance of the intervention items was similar to that observed in the different centres at the beginning of the implementation of the I-PASS program; a significant difference was also shown after the implementation of the quality improvement (14,15).

In a report of AE in hospital wards of 16 teaching and non-teaching hospitals it was also not possible to observe an improvement in the number of AE over time. The AE rate was higher in academic hospitals (26.2 AE per 1000 patient days [95% CI: 23.7–29.0]) (16). We recruited only teaching hospitals and to our knowledge this is the first study to use the GAPPS tool exclusively in PICUs, and the first one using the tools in Spanish. Although the number of AE was higher than that described by Stockwell et al. this study included patients with less severity than those evaluated in our study.

Conclusions

In conclusion we observed an improvement in the quality of handoffs after the implementation of a standardized handoff intervention. No differences were observed in the AE after the use of I-PASS, nor in the perception of improvement in communication.

Further research is needed to determine whether this intervention could reduce AE either by different implementation models for a longer duration or using different outcomes measures.

Conflict of Interest: None to declare.

Funding: Salud Investiga “Dr. Abraam Sonis” grant, category Multicentric Study, funded by National Ministry of Health, through the Directorate of Research for Health, Argentine.

The funders of the study had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report.

Acknowledgments: The author would like to thank specially Amy Starmer for her assistance with the adaptation of the I-PASS bundle and Christopher Landrigan for his assistance with the GAPPS tool use. Also, we would like to thank to the staff of the Hospital General de Niños Pedro de Elizalde, Hospital General de Niños Ricardo Gutierrez, Units 44 and 45 of the Hospital Nacional de Pediatría "J. P. Garrahan", Hospital de Niños de San Justo and Hospital Materno Infantil "Héctor Quintana".

Primary data that supports these findings is available at Open Science Framework. Final D.O.I. to be released on publication.

REFERENCES

1. WHO | WHO Strategic Communications Framework. WHO [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2018 May 4]; Available from: <http://www.who.int/communicating-for-health/en/>
2. Sentinel Event Data - Event Type by Year | The Joint Commission [Internet]. [cited 2020 May 11].

Available from: <https://www.jointcommission.org/en/resources/patient-safety-topics/sentinel-event/sentinel-event-data---event-type-by-year/>

3. The Joint Commission. Improving handoff communications: meeting national patient safety goal 2E. *Jt Comm Perspect Patient Saf.* 2006;6(8):9–15.
4. Amato-vealey EJ, Barba MP, Vealey RJ. Hand-Off Communication: A Requisite for Perioperative Patient Safety FOR. *AORN J* [Internet]. 2008;88(5):763–74. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aorn.2008.07.022>
5. Vidyarthi AR, Arora V, Schnipper JL, Wall SD, Wachter RM. Managing discontinuity in academic medical centers: strategies for a safe and effective resident sign-out. Vol. 1, *Journal of hospital medicine (Online)*. *J Hosp Med*; 2006. p. 257–66.
6. Starmer AJ, Sectish TC, Simon DW, Keohane C, McSweeney ME, Chung EY, et al. Rates of Medical Errors and Preventable Adverse Events Among Hospitalized Children Following Implementation of a Resident Handoff Bundle. *JAMA* [Internet]. 2013 Dec 4 [cited 2018 Mar 7];310(21):2262. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24302089>
7. Starmer AJ, Spector ND, Srivastava R, West DC, Rosenbluth G, Allen AD, et al. Changes in Medical Errors after Implementation of a Handoff Program. *N Engl J Med* [Internet]. 2014 Nov 6 [cited 2018 Mar 4];371(19):1803–12. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25372088>
8. Maxson PM, Derby KM, Wroblewski DM, Foss DM. Bedside nurse-to-nurse handoff promotes patient safety. *Medsurg Nurs* [Internet]. [cited 2018 Mar 4];21(3):140–4; quiz 145. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22866433>
9. Rüdiger-Stürchler M, Keller DI, Bingisser R. Emergency physician intershift handover - can a dINAMO checklist speed it up and improve quality? *Swiss Med Wkly* [Internet]. 2010 Sep 24 [cited 2018 Mar 4];140:w13085. Available from: <http://doi.emh.ch/smw.2010.13085>
10. DeRienzo CM, Frush K, Barfield ME, Gopwani PR, Griffith BC, Jiang X “Sara, et al. Handoffs in the Era of Duty Hours Reform. *Acad Med* [Internet]. 2012 Apr [cited 2019 Apr 8];87(4):403–10. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22361790>
11. Riesenber LA, Leitzsch J, Massucci JL, Jaeger J, Rosenfeld JC, Patow C, et al. Residents’ and Attending Physicians’ Handoffs: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Acad Med* [Internet]. 2009 Dec [cited 2018 May 4];84(12):1775–87. Available from: <https://insights.ovid.com/crossref?an=00001888-200912000-00030>
12. Riesenber LA, Leitzsch J, Little BW. Systematic Review of Handoff Mnemonics Literature. [cited 2018 May 4]; Available from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1062860609332512>
13. Landrigan CP, Stockwell D, Toomey SL, Loren S, Tracy M, Jang J, et al. Performance of the Global Assessment of Pediatric Patient Safety (GAPPS) Tool. *Pediatrics* [Internet]. 2016 Jun 1 [cited 2018 Mar 4];137(6):e20154076–e20154076. Available from: <http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/cgi/doi/10.1542/peds.2015-4076>

14. Stockwell DC, Landrigan CP, Toomey SL, Loren SS, Jang J, Quinn JA, et al. Adverse Events in Hospitalized Pediatric Patients. *Pediatrics* [Internet]. 2018 Aug [cited 2019 Jan 14];142(2):e20173360. Available from: <http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/lookup/doi/10.1542/peds.2017-3360>
15. Hemming K, Haines TP, Chilton PJ, Girling AJ, Lilford RJ. The stepped wedge cluster randomised trial: Rationale, design, analysis, and reporting. *BMJ*. 2015 Feb 6;350.
16. García-Roig C, Viard MV, García-Elorrio E, Suárez-Anzorena I, Jorro Barón F. Implementation of a structured patient handoff between health care providers at a private facility in the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires. *Arch Argent Pediatr* [Internet]. 2020 Jun 1 [cited 2020 Aug 10];118(3). Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32470256/>
17. Jorro-Barón F, Pumara CD, Tittarelli MAJ, Raimondo A, Urtasun M, Valentini L. Improved Handoff Quality and Reduction in Adverse Events following implementation of a Spanish-language version of the IPASS bundle for pediatric hospitalized patients in Argentina. *J Patient Saf Risk Manag*.
18. King HB, Battles J, Baker DP, Alonso A, Salas E, Webster J, et al. TeamSTEPSTM: Team Strategies and Tools to Enhance Performance and Patient Safety [Internet]. *Advances in Patient Safety: New Directions and Alternative Approaches (Vol. 3: Performance and Tools)*. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2008 [cited 2019 Jul 11]. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21249942>
19. Starmer AJ, Spector ND, Srivastava R, Allen AD, Landrigan CP, Sectish TC, et al. I-pass, a mnemonic to standardize verbal handoffs. *Pediatrics* [Internet]. 2012 Feb 1 [cited 2018 Mar 4];129(2):201–4. Available from: <http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/cgi/doi/10.1542/peds.2011-2966>
20. Starmer AJ, Toole JKO, Rosenbluth G, Calaman S, Balmer D, West DC, et al. Development, Implementation, and Dissemination of the I-PASS Handoff Curriculum: A Multisite Educational Intervention to Improve Patient Handoffs. 2014;89(6):876–84.
21. Loren SS. Global Assessment of Pediatric Patient Safety (GAPPS): A Pediatric Trigger Tool for Measuring Adverse Events MANUAL OF OPERATIONS Center of Excellence for Pediatric Quality Measurement Division of General Pediatrics Boston Children ' s Hospital February. 2016;(February):1–470.
22. for Healthcare Research A. Cuestionario sobre la de seguridad de los pacientes en los hospitales [Internet]. [cited 2019 Jun 10]. Available from: https://www.ahrq.gov/sites/default/files/wysiwyg/professionals/quality-patient-safety/patientsafetyculture/hospital/resources/hospform_sp.pdf
23. Huth K, Schwartz S, Li SA, Weiser N, Mahant S, Landrigan CP, et al. “All the ward’s a stage”: a qualitative study of the experience of direct observation of handoffs. *Adv Heal Sci Educ*. 2019 May 1;24(2):301–15.
24. Arora V, Johnson J. A model for building a standardized hand-off protocol. *Jt Comm J Qual patient*

Saf [Internet]. 2006 Nov [cited 2018 Mar 4];32(11):646–55. Available from:

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17120925>

25. Horwitz LI, Moin T, Krumholz HM, Wang L, Bradley EH. Consequences of inadequate sign-out for patient care. *Arch Intern Med*. 2008 Sep 8;168(16):1755–60.
26. Huth K, Hart F, Moreau K, Baldwin K, Parker K, Creery D, et al. Real-World Implementation of a Standardized Handover Program (I-PASS) on a Pediatric Clinical Teaching Unit. *Acad Pediatr* [Internet]. 2016 Aug [cited 2018 Nov 13];16(6):532–9. Available from: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1876285916302911>
27. Sheth S, Mccarthy E, Kipps AK, Wood M. Changes in Efficiency and Safety Culture After Integration of an I-PASS – Supported Handoff Process. 2016;137(2).




Figure 1. Consort diagram




Figure 2: Percentage of verbal handoffs that included key data elements (all sites combined).

Key elements evaluated for oral handoffs included an illness-severity assessment (unstable, watcher, stable), patient summary (defined as an oral handoff of at least three of the following: summary statement, events leading up to admission, hospital course, ongoing assessment, and active plans), action list (defined as a clearly articulated list of “to-do” items or a statement of “nothing to do”), situations & contingency plans (defined as an indication of what to do if adverse contingencies occur, or an explicit indication that no adverse contingencies were anticipated), and synthesis by the receiver (defined as readback mostly performed with small correction required or readback fully performed without need for correction), complete patient data (defined as three identification including name), transfer of erroneous information (defined as information not belong to the patient or old fashioned), omission of information (defined as omission of more than one principal diagnoses or treatment), unrelated information (defined as information not related to the patient being handoff), accuracy of illness severity (defined as illness-severity assessment of the handoff giver and the one registered in the patient medical record), correct handoff rhythm (defined as normal rhythm of spoken voice without long interruptions), patient summary quality (as compared to the patient medical record), active listening (evaluates the receiver’s attention), non-relevant information (delivered by the receiver in the synthesis), adequate synthesis length (defined as no longer than 1 minute), adequate of the receiver’s questions (defined as questions related to patient state as compared to medical record).




Figure 3: Percentage of written handoffs documents that included key data elements (all sites combined).

Key elements evaluated for oral handoffs included an illness-severity assessment (unstable, watcher, stable), patient summary (defined as an oral handoff of at least three of the following: summary statement, events leading up to admission, hospital course, ongoing assessment, and active plans), action list (defined as a clearly articulated list of “to-do” items or a statement of “nothing to do”), situations & contingency plans (defined as an indication of what to do if adverse contingencies occur, or an explicit indication that no adverse contingencies were anticipated), and synthesis by the receiver (defined as a remainder to do the synthesis in the document), complete patient data (defined as three identification including name), omission of information (defined as omission of more than one principal diagnoses or treatment), unrelated information (defined as information not related to the patient being handoff), accuracy of illness severity (defined as illness-severity assessment in the document and the one registered in the patient medical record), correct handoff rhythm (defined as normal rhythm of spoken voice without long interruptions), patient summary quality (as compared to the patient medical record), length of handoff written document .