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Minutes/ Summary of event:

NW welcomed the audience to this first event. The 17 included students, nurses, ODPs, managers, educators and medics from ED, Critical Care, Anaesthesia, Theatres, Paediatrics, HCOP and academia. The purpose of the “Quality Forum” (QF) was explained. It has a wide remit of sharing interesting research and work associated with patient safety, human factors and ergonomics, quality improvement, medical education etc.

Today’s QF was about quantitative research and started with a brief “crash course” in key terms, approaches to and analysis of quantitative data. NW provided an overview of statistical tests and data, sampling and bias was discussed. Key slides are available.

The paper was then critiqued. This was initially going to be a presentation of the case and then group discussion, but it resulted in a presentation of each section of the paper with general critique and discussion as NW went through. This provided a forum where everyone had input in to the case and their thoughts were welcome.

The paper provided an interesting consideration of the role of rapid response teams (RRTs) in identifying adverse events compared to an incident reporting system. This was Canadian-based research and included a wide range of statistical techniques to find meaning in the data. They concluded:

1) That RRTs identified a higher number of AEs than incident reporting systems
2) That this could be used to identify improvement ideas

The Forum debated the relevance of the paper to the UK and the “soundness” of the methodology and statistical approach. A few key points included:

- Considerable bias from those reporting AEs as they had been asked to identify them, therefore was reporting likely to be higher?
- A number of cases were not reported, withdrawal bias, why?
- They were working with small numbers that makes the research limited
- There was only moderate agreement for inter-rater and intra-rater reliability

It was felt that the approach of focussed AE reporting, e.g. recognise and rescue incidents was a potential avenue to explore, but felt that this particular research was limited. The range of statistical tests used suggested that the authors were searching for significance in their data without clear objective.

Next month- Qualitative Data!! 30th March 2016.