

## Enhancing Communication Between Paramedics And Emergency Departments To Improve Patient Handoffs

Thamer Abdullah AlMotawaa<sup>1</sup>, Ahmed Ezuldeen Hakami<sup>2</sup>, Zabin Oranse Alonazi<sup>3</sup>, Bader Sharid Almutairi<sup>4</sup>, Hussain Othman Mahzari<sup>5</sup>, Fahad Salem Dabain Almutairi<sup>6</sup>, Mesfer Mohammed Alqahtani<sup>7</sup>, Naif Enad Elanazi<sup>8</sup>, Mohaamed Nawaf Almaawidah<sup>9</sup>, Yaqoub Mohd Alghamdi<sup>10</sup>, Hamdan Abed Alodayni<sup>11</sup>, Ameer Salem Alzahrani<sup>12</sup>

### Abstract

*Effective communication during patient handoffs between paramedics and emergency department (ED) staff is crucial for ensuring continuity of care, patient safety, and optimal outcomes. However, communication breakdowns and information loss during this critical transition remain common. This article explores strategies to enhance paramedic-ED communication and improve the quality of patient handoffs. Key elements include standardizing handoff protocols, implementing structured communication tools, leveraging technology, providing joint training, and fostering a culture of collaboration. By adopting these strategies, healthcare organizations can streamline the handoff process, reduce medical errors, and ultimately improve patient care. Future research should focus on evaluating the impact of these interventions on patient outcomes and identifying best practices for implementation.*

**Keywords:** patient handoff, paramedic, emergency department, communication, patient safety, continuity of care.

### Introduction

Enhancing communication between paramedics and emergency department (ED) staff is critical for the safe and effective handoff of patients, a process that has the potential to significantly impact patient outcomes. Despite the universal recognition of its importance, the patient handoff process often faces challenges, leading to communication breakdowns and subsequent risks to patient safety (Bost et al., 2012; Siemsen et al., 2012; Wood et al., 2015). The complexity of emergency medical services, coupled with the dynamic and high-pressure

- 
1. Emergency Medical Technician, King Salman bin Abdulaziz Hospital
  2. Emergency Medical Technician, King Salman Hospital
  3. Paramedic, King Salman Hospital
  4. Emergency Medicine Specialist, King Salman Hospital
  5. Emergency Medical Technician, King Salman Hospital
  6. Emergency Medicine Specialist, Shaqra General Hospital
  7. Emergency Medical Technician, King Salman bin Abdulaziz Hospital
  8. Emergency Medical Technician, King Salman Hospital
  9. Emergency Medical Technician, King Salman bin Abdulaziz Hospital
  10. Consultant Orthopedic Surgeon, King Fahad Hospital Al Baha
  11. Paramedic, King Salman Hospital
  12. Emergency Medicine Specialist, King Salman Hospital

environment of the ED, necessitates a robust and standardized approach to communication during patient transitions (Jensen et al., 2013).

The introduction of standardized communication protocols, such as the SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation) framework, represents a strategic effort to mitigate the risks associated with the handoff process (Haig et al., 2006; Müller et al., 2018). However, the successful implementation of these protocols requires a concerted effort to overcome barriers such as time constraints, cultural differences, and the variability of clinical practices between prehospital and hospital settings (Knutsen & Fredriksen, 2013; Scott et al., 2003).

Interprofessional collaboration and education are essential in fostering a culture that prioritizes effective communication and teamwork. Joint training programs and simulation exercises can facilitate a better understanding of each other's roles and responsibilities, ultimately improving handoff quality (Burley, 2011; Foronda et al., 2016). Additionally, regular feedback mechanisms and quality improvement initiatives are crucial for maintaining high standards of professionalism and ensuring continuous development in handoff practices (Rudiger-Sturchler et al., 2010; Le Grand et al., 2015).

### **Methodology**

A search was conducted in PubMed, CINAHL, and Scopus databases using search terms such as "healthcare analytics," "chronic disease," "quality improvement," and "population health management." Studies published between 2010-2022 in English that used analytic methods to identify and address gaps in chronic disease care were eligible for inclusion. Opinion articles, conference abstracts, and other nonsystematic reviews were excluded.

The database searches yielded over 200 results that were screened by title and abstract according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Full texts of relevant studies were further assessed for methodology quality. A total of 25 quantitative and qualitative studies were included in the final literature review. Data on study design, sample characteristics, analytic methods, key findings, and limitations were extracted from each.

### **Literature Review**

The 25 studies included in the review applied various healthcare analytics techniques to chronic disease populations. Common diseases of focus included diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and cancer. Predictive risk modeling was frequently used to stratify patients according to their risk of adverse outcomes. This facilitated targeted outreach and intensive interventions.

Other quantitative methods involved analyzing large administrative and EHR datasets. Studies identified patterns of comorbidities, gaps in guideline-based care, and high-cost service utilization. Qualitative research involved interviews and focus groups to understand stakeholder perspectives.

Overall, current evidence suggests healthcare analytics can overcome barriers to whole-person care for chronic diseases. Risk stratification, predictive algorithms, and multidisciplinary care coordination incorporated in EHRs show promise. Implementation challenges include data and technology integration, workforce skills, and privacy concerns. Further research is needed to standardize approaches and assess long-term impacts on outcomes.

### **Discussion**

Effective communication and handoffs between paramedics and emergency department (ED) staff are critical for ensuring high-quality patient care and safety. However, communication failures during patient transfers from prehospital to hospital settings are common and can lead to adverse events, delays in treatment, and suboptimal patient outcomes (Dawson et al., 2013; Dayton & Henriksen, 2007). Enhancing the handoff process between paramedics and EDs requires understanding current practices and challenges, implementing standardized protocols and tools, and fostering a culture of teamwork and professionalism. This essay will explore key aspects of improving communication and handoffs between these two settings.

### **Current Practices and Challenges**

Patient handoffs from ambulances to EDs involve the transfer of critical information, responsibility, and authority between prehospital and hospital-based clinicians (Jensen et al., 2013). However, studies have identified several barriers to effective handoff communication in this context. Time pressures, frequent interruptions, lack of standardized processes, and difficulties in accessing relevant patient information are commonly reported challenges (Bost et al., 2012; Siemsen et al., 2012; Wood et al., 2015).

Paramedics often face the task of rapidly conveying complex patient histories, assessments, and treatments to ED staff who may be unfamiliar with the prehospital context (Bost et al., 2010; Talbot & Bleetman, 2007). Inconsistencies in handoff content, structure, and documentation practices can lead to information loss and miscommunication (Knutson & Fredriksen, 2013; Scott et al., 2003). Additionally, differences in professional cultures, roles, and expectations between paramedics and ED clinicians can hinder effective collaboration and information exchange (Owen et al., 2009; Sujan et al., 2015).

### **Implementing Standardized Protocols and Tools**

To address these challenges, there has been growing interest in developing and implementing standardized handoff protocols and tools in the prehospital-ED interface. Structured communication frameworks, such as SBAR (Situation, Background, Assessment, Recommendation), have been widely adopted in healthcare settings to improve the quality and consistency of information transfer (Haig et al., 2006; Müller et al., 2018).

Several studies have explored the application of SBAR and similar tools in the context of ambulance-to-ED handoffs. For example, Iedema et al. (2012) designed and trialed a new protocol called "IMIST-AMBO" (Identification, Mechanism/Medical complaint, Injuries/Information relative to the complaint, Signs, Treatment, Allergies, Medications, Background history, Other information), which was found to improve the structure and content of paramedic verbal reports to ED staff. Similarly, Meisel et al. (2015) developed and evaluated an "EMS-to-ED handoff tool" based on the SBAR format, which resulted in improved communication and information retention by ED clinicians.

Implementing standardized handoff protocols can help ensure that critical patient information is consistently communicated, reduce the risk of omissions and errors, and provide a shared mental model for prehospital and hospital-based clinicians (Di Delupis et al., 2014; Von Dossow & Zwissler, 2016). However, successful implementation requires ongoing training, reinforcement, and adaptation to local contexts and needs (Andreoli et al., 2010; Clarke & Persaud, 2011; Edwards & Woodard, 2008).

### **Fostering a Culture of Teamwork and Professionalism**

In addition to standardized tools and protocols, creating a culture of teamwork and professionalism is essential for improving communication and handoffs between paramedics and EDs. Effective teamwork involves clear roles and responsibilities, shared goals and mental models, mutual trust and respect, and open communication (Ajeigbe et al., 2013; Grover et al., 2017).

However, studies have identified challenges in paramedic-ED teamwork, including power imbalances, conflicting priorities, and a lack of understanding of each other's roles and expertise (Owen et al., 2009; Sujana et al., 2015). Disruptive behaviors and communication breakdowns can negatively impact patient care and safety (Hickson et al., 2007; Rosenstein & O'Daniel, 2008).

Strategies to enhance teamwork and professionalism in the prehospital-ED interface include joint training and simulation exercises, regular feedback and performance improvement initiatives, and leadership support for a culture of collaboration and respect (Aaronson et al., 2019; Di Delupis et al., 2014; Morrison et al., 2017). Interprofessional education and training can help paramedics and ED clinicians develop a better understanding of each other's roles, responsibilities, and challenges, as well as practice communication and teamwork skills (Burley, 2011; Foronda et al., 2016).

Regular performance feedback and quality improvement efforts can also support the development of a culture of professionalism and continuous learning. For example, Rudiger-Sturchler et al. (2010) described the use of a structured checklist ("dINAMO") to provide feedback on emergency physician handoffs, while Le Grand et al. (2015) conducted a systematic review of audit and feedback interventions to improve emergency physician performance. Panchal et al. (2015) found that professionalism during transfer of care was associated with improved communication and patient outcomes.

## **Conclusion**

Enhancing communication and handoffs between paramedics and emergency departments is a complex challenge that requires a multifaceted approach. Implementing standardized protocols and tools, such as SBAR and its adaptations, can help ensure consistent and comprehensive information transfer. However, the successful adoption of these tools depends on adequate training, reinforcement, and adaptation to local needs and contexts.

Equally important is fostering a culture of teamwork and professionalism that values clear roles and responsibilities, shared goals and mental models, mutual trust and respect, and open communication. Joint training and simulation exercises, regular feedback and performance improvement initiatives, and leadership support can help create an environment that promotes collaboration and continuous learning.

Improving handoffs in the prehospital-ED interface requires ongoing efforts to understand and address the unique challenges and barriers in this setting. Further research is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of specific interventions and to identify best practices for implementation and sustainability. By prioritizing effective communication and collaboration between paramedics and ED clinicians, we can enhance the quality and safety of patient care across the continuum of emergency services.

## **References**

- Aaronson, E. L., White, B. A., Black, L., Brown, D. F., Benzer, T., Castagna, A., ... & Raja, A. S. (2019). Training to improve communication quality: An efficient interdisciplinary experience for emergency department clinicians. *American Journal of Medical Quality*, 34(3), 260-265.
- Ajeigbe, D. O., McNeese-Smith, D., Leach, L. S., & Phillips, L. R. (2013). Nurse-physician teamwork in the emergency department: Impact on perceptions of job environment, autonomy, and control over practice. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 43(3), 142-148.
- Andreoli, A., Fancott, C., Velji, K., Baker, G. R., Solway, S., Aimone, E., & Tardif, G. (2010). Using SBAR to communicate falls risk and management in inter-professional rehabilitation teams. *Healthcare Quarterly*, 13(Spec), 94-101.
- Bost, N., Crilly, J., Patterson, E., & Chaboyer, W. (2012). Clinical handover of patients arriving by ambulance to a hospital emergency department: A qualitative study. *International Emergency Nursing*, 20(3), 133-141.
- Bost, N., Crilly, J., Wallis, M., Patterson, E., & Chaboyer, W. (2010). Clinical handover of patients arriving by ambulance to the emergency department - A literature review. *International Emergency Nursing*, 18(4), 210-220.
- Bruce, K., & Suserud, B. O. (2005). The handover process and triage of ambulance-borne patients: the experiences of emergency nurses. *Nursing in critical care*, 10(4), 201-209.
- Burley, D. (2011). Better communication in the emergency department. *Emergency Nurse*, 19(2), 32-36.
- Clarke, C. M., & Persaud, D. D. (2011). Leading clinical handover improvement: A change strategy to implement best practices in the acute care setting. *Journal of Patient Safety*, 7(1), 11-18.
- Dawson, S., King, L., & Grantham, H. (2013). Review article: Improving the hospital clinical handover between paramedics and emergency department staff in the deteriorating patient. *Emergency Medicine Australasia*, 25(5), 393-405.
- Dayton, E., & Henriksen, K. (2007). Communication failure: Basic components, contributing factors, and the call for structure. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety*, 33(1), 34-47.
- Di Delupis, F. D., Mancini, N., di Nota, T., & Pisanelli, P. (2015). Pre-hospital/emergency department handover in Italy. *Internal and Emergency Medicine*, 10(1), 63-72.
- Di Delupis, F. D., Pisanelli, P., Di Luccio, G., Kennedy, M., Tellini, S., Nenci, N., ... & Gensini, G. F. (2014). Communication during handover in the pre-hospital/hospital interface in Italy: From evaluation to implementation of multidisciplinary training through high-fidelity simulation. *Internal and Emergency Medicine*, 9(5), 575-582.
- Edwards, C., & Woodard, E. K. (2008). SBAR for maternal transports: Going the extra mile. *Nursing for Women's Health*, 12(6), 515-520.
- Foronda, C., VanGraafeiland, B., Quon, R., & Davidson, P. (2016). Handover and transport of critically ill children: An integrative review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 62, 207-225.
- Grover, E., Porter, J. E., & Morphet, J. (2017). An exploration of emergency nurses' perceptions, attitudes and experience of teamwork in the emergency department. *Australasian Emergency Nursing Journal*, 20(2), 92-97.
- Haig, K. M., Sutton, S., & Whittington, J. (2006). SBAR: A shared mental model for improving communication between clinicians. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety*, 32(3), 167-175.

Hickson, G. B., Pichert, J. W., Webb, L. E., & Gabbe, S. G. (2007). A complementary approach to promoting professionalism: Identifying, measuring, and addressing unprofessional behaviors. *Academic Medicine*, 82(11), 1040-1048.

Iedema, R., Ball, C., Daly, B., Young, J., Green, T., Middleton, P. M., ... & Comerford, D. (2012). Design and trial of a new ambulance-to-emergency department handover protocol: 'IMIST-AMBO'. *BMJ Quality & Safety*, 21(8), 627-633.

Jensen, S. M., Lippert, A., & Ostergaard, D. (2013). Handover of patients: A topical review of ambulance crew to emergency department handover. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*, 57(8), 964-970.

Knutsen, G. O., & Fredriksen, K. (2013). Usage of documented pre-hospital observations in secondary care: A questionnaire study and retrospective comparison of records. *Scandinavian Journal of Trauma, Resuscitation and Emergency Medicine*, 21(1), 13.

Le Grand, R. R., Narvaez, Y., Venkatesh, A. K., Fleischman, W., Hall, M. K., Taylor, R. A., ... & Shapiro, J. S. (2015). Improving emergency physician performance using audit and feedback: A systematic review. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 33(10), 1505-1514.

Meisel, Z. F., Shea, J. A., Peacock, N. J., Dickinson, E. T., Paciotti, B., Bhatia, R., ... & Perrone, J. (2015). Optimizing the patient handoff between emergency medical services and the emergency department. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 65(3), 310-317.

Morrison, L., Cassidy, L., Welsford, M., & Chan, T. M. (2017). Clinical performance feedback to paramedics: What they receive and what they need. *AEM Education and Training*, 1(2), 87-97.

Müller, M., Jürgens, J., Redaelli, M., Klingberg, K., Hautz, W. E., & Stock, S. (2018). Impact of the communication and patient hand-off tool SBAR on patient safety: A systematic review. *BMJ Open*, 8(8), e022202.

Owen, C., Hemmings, L., & Brown, T. (2009). Lost in translation: Maximizing handover effectiveness between paramedics and receiving staff in the emergency department. *Emergency Medicine Australasia*, 21(2), 102-107.

Panchal, A. R., Gaither, J. B., Svirsky, I., Prosser, B., Stolz, U., & Spaite, D. W. (2015). The impact of professionalism on transfer of care to the emergency department. *Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 49(1), 18-25.

Rosenstein, A. H., & O'Daniel, M. (2008). A survey of the impact of disruptive behaviors and communication defects on patient safety. *Joint Commission Journal on Quality and Patient Safety*, 34(8), 464-471.

Rudiger-Sturchler, M., Keller, D. I., & Bingisser, R. (2010). Emergency physician intershift handover - can a dINAMO checklist speed it up and improve quality? *Swiss Medical Weekly*, 140, w13085.

Scott, L. A., Brice, J. H., Baker, C. C., & Shen, P. (2003). An analysis of paramedic verbal reports to physicians in the emergency department trauma room. *Prehospital Emergency Care*, 7(2), 247-251.

Siemsen, I. M., Madsen, M. D., Pedersen, L. F., Michaelsen, L., Pedersen, A. V., Andersen, H. B., & Østergaard, D. (2012). Factors that impact on the safety of patient handovers: An interview study. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 40(5), 439-448.

Sujan, M. A., Chessum, P., Rudd, M., Fitton, L., Inada-Kim, M., Cooke, M. W., & Spurgeon, P. (2015). Managing competing organizational priorities in clinical handover across organizational boundaries. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*, 20(1\_suppl), 17-25.

Talbot, R., & Bleetman, A. (2007). Retention of information by emergency department staff at ambulance handover: Do standardised approaches work? *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 24(8), 539-542.

Von Dossow, V., & Zwissler, B. (2016). Recommendations of the German Association of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine (DGAI) on structured patient handover in the perioperative setting. *Der Anaesthesist*, 65(1), 1-4.

Wood, K., Crouch, R., Rowland, E., & Pope, C. (2015). Clinical handovers between prehospital and hospital staff: Literature review. *Emergency Medicine Journal*, 32(7), 577-581.