

## E-SUPPLEMENT

### Interprofessional Education for Delirium Management: a Quality Improvement Project

Florian Schimböck<sup>1a</sup>, Volkmar Hanisch<sup>2b</sup>, Ulf Günther<sup>3</sup>, Hans-Christian Hansen<sup>4,5</sup>, Rebecca von Haken<sup>6</sup>, Carsten Hermes<sup>7</sup>, Carolin Hoyer<sup>8</sup>, Arnold Kaltwasser<sup>9</sup>, Sabrina Pelz<sup>10</sup>, Peter Nydahl<sup>11,12</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Nursing Education, Department of General Medicine, University Hospital of Schleswig-Holstein, <sup>2</sup> Center of Intensive Care and Emergency Medicine, Sana Kliniken Niederlausitz gGmbH, <sup>3</sup> Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care, Klinikum Oldenburg und Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, <sup>4</sup> Department of Neurology, Universität Hamburg, <sup>5</sup> Department of Neurology, Friedrich-Ebert-Krankenhaus Neumünster GmbH, <sup>6</sup> Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, University Hospital Mannheim, <sup>7</sup> University of Applied Science, Hamburg, <sup>8</sup> Department for Neurology, University Hospital Mannheim, <sup>9</sup> Academy of the District Hospitals Reutlingen GmbH, <sup>10</sup> Intensive Care Unit and Nursing Development, Universitätsklinikum Tübingen, <sup>11</sup> Nursing Research, University Hospital Schleswig-Holstein Kiel, <sup>12</sup> Institute of Nursing Science and Development, Paracelsus Medical University Salzburg, Austria

### Content

Table E1. Revised Standards for Quality Improvement Reporting Excellence

**Table E1: Revised Standards for Quality Improvement Reporting Excellence**

Text Section and Item Name	Section or Item Description	Page
<b>Title and Abstract</b>		
<b>1. Title</b>	Indicate that the manuscript concerns an <a href="#">initiative</a> to improve healthcare (broadly defined to include the quality, safety, effectiveness, patient-centeredness, timeliness, cost, efficiency, and equity of healthcare)	1
<b>2. Abstract</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Provide adequate information to aid in searching and indexing</li> <li>b. Summarize all key information from various sections of the text using the abstract format of the intended publication or a structured summary such as: background, local <a href="#">problem</a>, methods, interventions, results, conclusions</li> </ul>	1-2
<b>Introduction</b>	<i>Why did you start?</i>	
<b>3. <a href="#">Problem Description</a></b>	Nature and significance of the local <a href="#">problem</a>	3
<b>4. Available knowledge</b>	Summary of what is currently known about the <a href="#">problem</a> , including relevant previous studies	3-4
<b>5. <a href="#">Rationale</a></b>	Informal or formal frameworks, models, concepts, and/or <a href="#">theories</a> used to explain the <a href="#">problem</a> , any reasons or <a href="#">assumptions</a> that were used to develop the <a href="#">intervention(s)</a> , and reasons why the <a href="#">intervention(s)</a> was expected to work	4-5
<b>6. Specific aims</b>	Purpose of the project and of this report	4
<b>Methods</b>	What did you do?	
<b>7. <a href="#">Context</a></b>	Contextual elements considered important at the outset of introducing the <a href="#">intervention(s)</a>	5
<b>8. <a href="#">Intervention(s)</a></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Description of the <a href="#">intervention(s)</a> in sufficient detail that others could reproduce it</li> <li>Specifics of the team involved in the work</li> </ul>	5
<b>9. Study of the Intervention(s)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Approach chosen for assessing the impact of the <a href="#">intervention(s)</a></li> <li>Approach used to establish whether the observed outcomes were due to the <a href="#">intervention(s)</a></li> </ul>	6
<b>10. Measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Measures chosen for studying <a href="#">processes</a> and outcomes of the <a href="#">intervention(s)</a>, including rationale for choosing them, their operational definitions, and their validity and reliability</li> <li>b. Description of the approach to the ongoing assessment of contextual elements that contributed to the success, failure, efficiency, and cost</li> <li>Methods employed for assessing completeness and accuracy of data</li> </ul>	6
<b>11. Analysis</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Qualitative and quantitative methods used to draw <a href="#">inferences</a> from the data</li> <li>Methods for understanding variation within the data, including the effects of time as a variable</li> </ul>	7
<b>12. Ethical Considerations</b>	<a href="#">Ethical aspects</a> of implementing and studying the <a href="#">intervention(s)</a> and how they were addressed, including, but not limited to, formal ethics review and potential conflict(s) of interest	4
<b>Results</b>	<i>What did you find?</i>	

<b>13. Results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Initial steps of the <a href="#">intervention(s)</a> and their evolution over time (e.g., time-line diagram, flow chart, or table), including modifications made to the intervention during the project</li> <li>b. Details of the <a href="#">process</a> measures and outcome</li> <li>c. Contextual elements that interacted with the <a href="#">intervention(s)</a></li> <li>d. Observed associations between outcomes, interventions, and relevant contextual elements</li> <li>e. Unintended consequences such as unexpected benefits, problems, failures, or costs associated with the <a href="#">intervention(s)</a>.</li> </ul> <p>Details about missing data</p>	8-10
<b>Discussion</b>	<i>What does it mean?</i>	
<b>14. Summary</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Key findings, including relevance to the <a href="#">rationale</a> and specific aims</li> </ul> <p>Particular strengths of the project</p>	11
<b>15. Interpretation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Nature of the association between the <a href="#">intervention(s)</a> and the outcomes</li> <li>b. Comparison of results with findings from other publications</li> <li>c. Impact of the project on people and <a href="#">systems</a></li> <li>d. Reasons for any differences between observed and anticipated outcomes, including the influence of <a href="#">context</a></li> </ul> <p>Costs and strategic trade-offs, including <a href="#">opportunity costs</a></p>	11-12
<b>16. Limitations</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Limits to the <a href="#">generalizability</a> of the work</li> <li>b. Factors that might have limited <a href="#">internal validity</a> such as confounding, bias, or imprecision in the design, methods, measurement, or analysis</li> </ul> <p>Efforts made to minimize and adjust for limitations</p>	12-13
<b>17. Conclusions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Usefulness of the work</li> <li>b. Sustainability</li> <li>c. Potential for spread to other <a href="#">contexts</a></li> <li>d. Implications for practice and for further study in the field</li> </ul> <p>Suggested next steps</p>	13
<b>Other information</b>		
<b>Funding</b>	Sources of funding that supported this work. Role, if any, of the funding organization in the design, implementation, interpretation, and reporting	Detail page

Ogrinc, G., Davies, L., Goodman, D., Batalden, P., Davidoff, F., & Stevens, D. (2016). SQUIRE 2.0 (Standards for QUality Improvement Reporting Excellence): revised publication guidelines from a detailed consensus process. *BMJ quality & safety*, 25(12), 986–992. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2015-004411>