

Supplemental digital content

Supplement 1. Patient Survey Form for Resource Scarcity

Supplement 2. COREQ (Consolidated criteria for Reporting Qualitative research) Checklist

Patient Survey Form for Resource Scarcity

Version PrioPan-Study

Adapted from S1-Leitlinie Guideline, Version 2.0



Hospital rechts der Isar



Technical University Munich

Patient: (Pseudonym) _____ Age: _____	Diagnosis (acute): _____ Diagnosis (chronic): _____ Date of ICU admission: _____
---	---

Part 1A: General health status (prior to acute illness)

Interdisciplinary team-based Decision-making	Surname, Name, Date Part 1	Surname, Name, Date Part 2	Surname, Name, Date Part 3
Physician / Speciality department			
Physician / ICU			
Physician / ICU			
Nurse / ICU			
Others (incl. Clinical ethicists)			
Date of prioritization team visit:			

1Score/Patient ECOG: or Karnofsky: or Clinical Frailty Scale:

Additional information:

Part 1B: Comorbidity (prior acute illness), that in severity or in combination decreases the probability to survive intensive care

Severe organ insufficiency heart lung liver kidney
 Severe generalized neurological disease
 Severe oncological disease
 Severe and irreversible immunodeficiency
 Multimorbidity

Charlson-Comorbidity-Index (CCI):

Part 1C: Patients' preferences

patient capable on admission

Health Care Proxy
 Yes, copy in medical record. yes, named verbally, date _____ No
Surname, Name: _____ **Phone:** _____

Advance directive exists (copy in medical record):
 Yes, Advance directive (AD) or Yes, Advance-Care-Planning Document No

Conversation with:
 patient (= current preferences)
 health care proxy (see above)
 legal representative **Name, Surname:** _____ **Phone:** _____
 Next of kin Relative, friend, neighbour
Name, Surname: _____ **Phone:** _____

→ Refusal of ICU-treatment
 → Informed consent to ICU-treatment
 → Patients' preferences are not elicitable/unknown

Part 2A: Severity of acute illness, duration and trajectory of intensive care

SOFA-Score: <input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/>	
Response to ongoing ICU-treatment:	Trend of SOFA-Score (↑↔↓): <input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/>
Day on ICU (ongoing): <input style="width: 50px;" type="text"/>	

Part 2B: Individual patient-centered treatment decision

<p>The goal of care is:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> to prolong life <input type="checkbox"/> to prolong health-related quality of life <input type="checkbox"/> palliation, not life prolonging</p>		
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Initiation/Continuation of intensive care, because the treatment goal remains realistic and patient consents to therapy.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Initiation/Continuation of intensive care, but with following limitations:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No CPR</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No invasive mechanical ventilation</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><input type="checkbox"/> no intubation,</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><input type="checkbox"/> no tracheotomy</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No haemodialysis</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other limitations:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> <hr style="margin-left: 20px;"/> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><input type="checkbox"/></p> <hr style="margin-left: 20px;"/>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Therapy redirected to palliative care, because</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Patient did not consent.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No medical indication, because</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><input type="checkbox"/> the process of dying has begun,</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><input type="checkbox"/> the therapy is estimated as futile because the treatment goal became unrealistic, or</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><input type="checkbox"/> the survival would depend on long-term in-hospital ICU-treatment.</p>
<p>In case of resource shortage</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Reevaluation by the prioritization team</p>		<p><input type="checkbox"/> palliative care, if appropriate and possible on ICU or if triage required refer to general ward immediately.</p>

Teil 3: Prioritization decision (ONLY in Phase C if really no other option is available)

The prioritization team (see documentation on page 1) has to reevaluate

- The assessment for the individual probability of survival of (potential or ongoing) intensive care with regard to a realistic, patient-centered treatment goal and
- The overall assessment of all patients who would need ICU resources as well as
- The current information about available internal and external capacities.

After these steps, following decision is documented here:

<p><input type="checkbox"/> Priority treatment (initiation/continuation of intensive care)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Non-priority treatment (Non-initiation or discontinuation of intensive care providing adequate medical treatment, including palliative care)</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><input type="checkbox"/> palliative care team <input type="checkbox"/> psychosocial support team</p>
<p>Information send to:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Executive committee of the hospital</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Head of the department</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Relatives by</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Attending physician/subspeciality <input type="checkbox"/> Attending physician/ICU</p>

COREQ (COnsolidated criteria for REporting Qualitative research) Checklist for Manuscript

Preparing for the worst case scenario: Intensivists simulate prioritization
and triage of scarce ICU-resources

A checklist of items that should be included in reports of qualitative research. You must report the page number in your manuscript where you consider each of the items listed in this checklist. If you have not included this information, either revise your manuscript accordingly before submitting or note N/A.

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
<i>Personal characteristics</i>			
Interviewer/facilitator	1	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	7
Credentials	2	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	1
Occupation	3	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	1
Gender	4	Was the researcher male or female?	N/A
Experience and training	5	What experience or training did the researcher have?	7, 8
<i>Relationship with participants</i>			
Relationship established	6	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	7
Participant knowledge of the interviewer	7	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	7
Interviewer characteristics	8	What characteristics were reported about the interviewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	7
Domain 2: Study design			
<i>Theoretical framework</i>			
Methodological orientation and Theory	9	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	6, 8
<i>Participant selection</i>			
Sampling	10	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	7
Method of approach	11	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	6
Sample size	12	How many participants were in the study?	10
Non-participation	13	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	10
<i>Setting</i>			
Setting of data collection	14	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	7
Presence of non-participants	15	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	7
Description of sample	16	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	10
<i>Data collection</i>			
Interview guide	17	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	7
Repeat interviews	18	Were repeat interviews carried out? If yes, how many?	N/A
Audio/visual recording	19	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	8
Field notes	20	Were field notes made during and/or after the interview or focus group?	7
Duration	21	What was the duration of the interviews or focus group?	7
Data saturation	22	Was data saturation discussed?	9
Transcripts returned	23	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or	9

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
		correction?	
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
<i>Data analysis</i>			
Number of data coders	24	How many data coders coded the data?	8
Description of the coding tree	25	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	9
Derivation of themes	26	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	9
Software	27	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	8
Participant checking	28	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	9
<i>Reporting</i>			
Quotations presented	29	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	10, 11, Table2
Data and findings consistent	30	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	9-12
Clarity of major themes	31	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	10-12
Clarity of minor themes	32	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	10-12

Developed from: Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2007. Volume 19, Number 6: pp. 349 – 357