

Obstetric Emergency Simulation: A Pre/Post Survey Analysis of High-Fidelity Teamwork Among Emergency Department Physicians

BROCK E. POLNASZEK, MD; LAURIE B. GRIFFIN, MD, PhD; ANNA R. WHELAN, MD; JOHN SOEHL, MD; MELISSA A. CLARK, PhD; ADAM K. LEWKOWITZ, MD, MPH; MAUREEN HAMEL, MD

KEYWORDS: Teamwork, Survey, Emergency Medicine

INTRODUCTION

Collaboration, efficiency, and communication are critical components of high-fidelity teamwork, which results in safe healthcare systems and improved perinatal outcomes.¹⁻⁵ Multiple non-health care industries have shown simulation is an effective tool to promote high-fidelity teamwork, particularly when teams are physically separated and work together rarely.¹⁻⁵ Obstetric emergencies can be unpredictable and may require multidisciplinary collaboration, factors that make these cases excellent opportunities for simulation based education.^{3,5} We therefore aimed to assess the impact of an obstetric emergency simulation on survey-based measurements of high-fidelity teamwork among emergency department physicians at a quaternary care center without a birthing unit or obstetric providers (maternal-fetal medicine physicians serve as obstetric consultants but are based in another hospital system).

METHODS

We conducted a pre/post-survey study of emergency department physicians who participated in an obstetric emergency simulation in May 2023. The study was deemed to be minimal risk and was IRB exempt #1966002-1. Five obstetric emergencies – eclampsia, cardiac arrest, post-mortem cesarean section, post-partum hemorrhage, and breech extraction – were selected jointly by emergency and maternal-fetal medicine physicians to serve as simulation cases. Obstetric emergency simulations were led jointly by a maternal-fetal medicine and emergency department physician. The survey was modified from existing high-fidelity teamwork surveys¹⁻⁴ composed of Likert-scale items (0=never to 10=always) and was collected one month pre- and one month post-obstetric emergency simulations. Pre/post medians for each survey item were calculated and compared using Wilcoxon rank-sum test. Pre-specified sub-group analyses included physician level of training (i.e., resident versus attending) and self-identified gender (i.e., male or female).

RESULTS

Pre/post-simulation surveys were completed by 38/46 (83%) and 34/46 (74%) of emergency department physicians respectively. Overall, the emergency department physicians reported higher levels of teamwork related to caring for patient with obstetric emergencies after the simulations than before (**Table 1**). Specifically, the following survey items

were higher after simulation: reported ability to execute evidence-based obstetric emergency management (median [interquartile range] 5.5 [3–8] vs 7 [5–8], $p=0.04$), feeling supported by staff at opposite healthcare system (6 [3–9] vs 8 [7–10], $p=0.002$), establishment of a care team leader (5 [2–9] vs 8 [6–10], $p=0.006$), assessment within 15 minutes of presentation to either healthcare system (5 [0–8] vs 7 [5–9], $p=0.001$), direct and closed-loop communication (6 [4–8] vs 8.5 [6–10], $p=0.001$), and timely adaption of obstetric emergency management plans (5 [1–9] vs 8 [5–10], $p=0.01$ **Table 1**) for the clinical scenario.

Sub-group analysis by emergency department physician training level (i.e., post-graduate residents ($n=26$) and attendings ($n=12$)) revealed similar improvement in high-fidelity teamwork survey components for the resident trainees. There were no statistically significant differences in high-fidelity teamwork survey components among attending emergency department physicians (**Tables 2a,b**).

However, sub-group analysis by self-identified gender demonstrated differences between groups: self-identified male emergency department physicians ($n=20$) reported post-simulation that teams were more likely to establish a care team leader (6 [4–9] vs 8 [8–10], $p=0.02$), have transparent thinking of care leader (5.5 [5–9] vs 8.5 [6–10], $p=0.03$), utilize direct and closed-loop communication (7 [5–8] vs 9 [8–10] and 6 [5–8] vs 8.5 [8–10], $p=0.001$ respectively) and have clear establishment of roles (6 [5–9] vs 8.5 [7–9], $p=0.04$). Conversely, self-identified female emergency department physicians ($n=18$) reported support from the opposite health care system (5 [4–8] vs 8.5 [8–9], $p=0.02$) and assessment within 15 minutes of arrival to the emergency department (3 [0–5] vs 8 [8–8], $p=0.02$) but there were no differences in other high-fidelity teamwork survey components.

CONCLUSION

Implementation of multidisciplinary obstetric emergency simulations, led by maternal fetal medicine physicians, for emergency physicians at a quaternary care center without obstetricians or a birthing center, resulted in improved survey-based assessments of high-fidelity teamwork among emergency department physicians. These findings are limited by our current inability to measure the decline of knowledge and sustained high-fidelity teamwork assessments over time. However, we intend to conduct ongoing assessments to address this limitation. Future research should examine how obstetric emergency simulations impact perinatal outcomes and high-fidelity teamwork culture across healthcare systems longitudinally.

Table 1. Obstetric emergency simulation pre/post survey among all emergency department physicians

High-fidelity teamwork survey item	Pre- N=38	Post- N=34	p-value
How often did you feel confident in your ability to identify an obstetric emergency?	6 [3–9]	7 [5–9]	0.12
How often did you feel confident in your ability to execute evidence-based management?	5.5 [3–8]	7 [5–8]	0.04
How often did your patient require a multidisciplinary care team?	8 [4–10]	8 [2–10]	0.85
How often did you feel supported when you asked for help from hospital 1 staff?	5 [3–10]	7 [5–9]	0.01
How often did you feel supported when you asked for help from hospital 2 staff?	6 [3–9]	8 [7–10]	0.002
In your opinion, how often did the team's overall performance meet the gold standard assessment as a multidisciplinary team within 15 minutes of arrival to the ED?	5 [0–8]	7 [5–9]	0.001
How often was a care team leader established?	5 [2–9]	8 [6–10]	0.006
How often was there transparent thinking by a care team leader?	5.5 [3–9]	8 [6–10]	0.008
How often was there direct communication amongst the team?	6 [3–9]	8.5 [6–10]	0.001
How often was their closed-loop communication amongst the team?	6 [4–8]	8 [5–10]	0.002
How often did other disciplines identify themselves?	6 [1–9]	7 [5–10]	0.02
How often did each team member have a clear role?	5 [3–9]	8 [5–10]	0.02
How often were priorities / order of action clearly delineated among the team?	5 [3–9]	8 [5–10]	0.04
How often were order of action (e.g. airway, breathing, circulation) correct according to the specific obstetric emergency?	8 [5–10]	9 [7–10]	0.10
How often were there disagreements among team members that negatively impacted patient outcomes?	2 [0–5]	1.5 [0–5]	0.59
How often did an individual team member fixate on the less emergent issue excluding other important aspect of care?	3 [0–5]	3 [0–5]	0.96
How often were there inappropriate assumptions of other team members capabilities?	3.5 [0–5]	2.5 [0–5]	0.17
How often were management plans adapted in a timely manner when the clinical situation changed?	5 [1–9]	8 [5–10]	0.04

Data median [interquartile range]; p-value calculate using Wilcoxon rank-sum test; responses to individual survey

References

- Armenia S, Thangamathesvaran L, Caine AD, King N, Kunac A, Merchant AM. The Role of High-Fidelity Team-Based Simulation in Acute Care Settings: A Systematic Review. *Surg J (N Y)*. Jul 2018;4(3):e136-e151. doi:10.1055/s-0038-1667315
- Guisse JM, Deering SH, Kanki BG, et al. Validation of a tool to measure and promote clinical teamwork. *Simul Healthc*. 2008;3(4):217-23. doi:10.1097/SIH.0b013e31816fdd0a
- Janssens S, Simon R, Barwick S, Beckmann M, Marshall S. Leadership sharing in maternity emergency teams: a retrospective cohort study in simulation. *BMJ Simul Technol Enhanc Learn*. 2020;6(3):135-139. doi:10.1136/bmjstel-2018-000409
- Weller J, Frengley R, Torrie J, et al. Evaluation of an instrument to measure teamwork in multidisciplinary critical care teams. *BMJ Qual Saf*. Mar 2011;20(3):216-22. doi:10.1136/bmjqs.2010.041913
- Tarrahi MJ, Kianpour M, Ghasemi M, Mohamadirizi S. The effectiveness of simulation training in obstetric emergencies: A meta-analysis. *J Educ Health Promot*. 2022;11:82. doi:10.4103/jehp.jehp_1360_20
- Anna R. Whelan, MD, University of Massachusetts Chan Medical School, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Division of Maternal Fetal Medicine, Worcester, Massachusetts.
- John Soehl, MD, Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Division of Maternal Fetal Medicine, Women & Infants Hospital, Providence, Rhode Island.
- Melissa A. Clark, PhD, Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Division of Maternal Fetal Medicine, Women & Infants Hospital, Department of Health Services, Policy and Practice, School of Public Health, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.
- Adam K. Lewkowitz, MD, MPH, Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Division of Maternal Fetal Medicine, Women & Infants Hospital, Providence, Rhode Island.
- Maureen Hamel, MD, Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Division of Maternal Fetal Medicine, Women & Infants Hospital, Providence, Rhode Island.

Authors

Brock E. Polnaszek, MD, Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Division of Maternal Fetal Medicine, Women & Infants Hospital, Providence, Rhode Island.

Laurie B. Griffin, MD, PhD, Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Division of Maternal Fetal Medicine, Women & Infants Hospital, Providence, Rhode Island.

Disclosures

Dr. Lewkowitz reports the following financial disclosures: Shields Pharmaceuticals 2021 and Pharmacosmos Therapeutics 2022.

Correspondence

Brock E. Polnaszek MD
 bpolnaszek@wihri.org

Tables 2a,b. Multidisciplinary obstetric emergency simulation pre/post survey among emergency department clinicians by resident and attending

Multidisciplinary high-fidelity survey item – POST-GRADUATE YEARS 1–5	Pre- N=26	Post- N=20	p-value
How often did you feel confident in your ability to identify an obstetric emergency?	6 [3–8]	8 [5–9]	0.04
How often did you feel confident in your ability to execute evidence-based management?	5 [4–8]	7 [5–8]	0.01
How often did your patient require a multidisciplinary care team?	7.5 [5–10]	8.5 [7–10]	0.08
How often did you feel supported when you asked for help from hospital 1 staff?	5 [3–10]	8 [5–9]	0.008
How often did you feel supported when you asked for help from hospital 2 staff?	6 [4–9]	8 [8–10]	0.003
In your opinion, how often did the team's overall performance meet the gold standard assessment as a multidisciplinary team within 15 minutes of arrival to the ED?	5 [0–7]	8 [5–9]	0.01
How often was a care team leader established?	5 [2–9]	10 [8–10]	0.01
How often was there transparent thinking by a care team leader?	6 [4–9]	9 [8–10]	0.002
How often was there direct communication amongst the team?	6.5 [5–9]	10 [8–10]	0.003
How often was their closed-loop communication amongst the team?	6 [5–8]	10 [8–10]	<0.001
How often did other disciplines identify themselves?	5 [4–9]	9 [7–10]	0.007
How often did each team member have a clear role?	5 [5–9]	9 [8–10]	0.01
How often were priorities / order of action clearly delineated among the team?	5 [5–9]	8 [8–10]	0.03
How often were order of action (e.g. airway, breathing, circulation) correct according to the specific obstetric emergency?	8 [5–10]	10 [8–10]	0.02
How often were there disagreements among team members that negatively impacted patient outcomes?	2 [0–5]	0 [0–2]	0.09
How often did an individual team member fixate on the less emergent issue excluding other important aspect of care?	2 [0–5]	2 [1–5]	0.86
How often were there inappropriate assumptions of other team members capabilities?	3 [0–5]	2 [0–3]	0.08
How often were management plans adapted in a timely manner when the clinical situation changed?	7 [3–9]	8 [7–10]	0.04

Multidisciplinary high-fidelity survey item – ATTENDING	Pre- N=12	Post- N=13	p-value
How often did you feel confident in your ability to identify an obstetric emergency?	7.5 [5–9]	7 [6–9]	0.93
How often did you feel confident in your ability to execute evidence-based management?	6.5 [6–8]	7 [6–8]	0.88
How often did your patient require a multidisciplinary care team?	8 [7–9]	6 [4–8]	0.14
How often did you feel supported when you asked for help from hospital 1 staff?	6 [3–7]	7 [5–8]	0.34
How often did you feel supported when you asked for help from hospital 2 staff?	7 [7–8]	8 [8–8]	0.56
In your opinion, how often did the team's overall performance meet the gold standard assessment as a multidisciplinary team within 15 minutes of arrival to the ED?	5 [3–5]	6 [6–6]	0.12
How often was a care team leader established?	4 [3–7]	7 [7–7]	0.10
How often was there transparent thinking by a care team leader?	5 [4–7]	6 [6–6]	0.62
How often was there direct communication amongst the team?	6 [5–6]	8 [8–8]	0.09
How often was their closed-loop communication amongst the team?	5 [5–6]	7.5 [7–8]	0.15
How often did other disciplines identify themselves?	6 [6–6]	6.5 [6–7]	0.58
How often did each team member have a clear role?	5 [5–6]	6.5 [6–7]	0.42
How often were priorities / order of action clearly delineated among the team?	5 [3–6]	5.5 [5–6]	0.35
How often were order of action (e.g. airway, breathing, circulation) correct according to the specific obstetric emergency?	7 [7–7]	8 [8–8]	0.69
How often were there disagreements among team members that negatively impacted patient outcomes?	2.5 [2–3]	4 [3–5]	0.46
How often did an individual team member fixate on the less emergent issue excluding other important aspect of care?	5 [5–5]	4 [3–5]	0.97
How often were there inappropriate assumptions of other team members capabilities?	5 [5–5]	4 [3–5]	0.52
How often were management plans adapted in a timely manner when the clinical situation changed?	5 [5–5]	6 [6–6]	0.31

Data median [interquartile range]; p-value calculate using Wilcoxon rank-sum test; responses to individual survey items vary