Supplemental digital content for Sperl-Hillen JA, O'Connor PJ, Ekstrom HL, Rush WA, Asche SE, Fernandes OD, Apana D, Amundson GH, Johnson PE, Curran DM. Educating Resident Physicians Using Virtual Case-Based Simulation Improves Diabetes Management: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Acad Med.

Supplemental Digital Table 1

Subgroup Analysis of Assessment Case Composite Goal Outcomes by PGY Level, from a Randomized Study of Virtual, Case-Based Simulation Improves Diabetes Management, 2010–2011^a

	No. (%)				
Case	Intervention ^b	Controlb	<i>P</i> -value		
Case 1					
Case to composite goal ignoring appropriate/ safe criteria					
All PGY	72 (74.7)	135 (20.3)	<.001°		
PGY1	33 (72.6)	46 (16.3)	<.001		
PGY2	33 (84.9)	48 (23.5)	<.001		
PGY3-4	30 (64.9)	41 (21.2)	.003		
Case to composite goal including appropriate/safe criteria					
All PGY	96 (21.2)	135 (1.8)	.002°		
PGY1	33 (29.9)	46 (0.0)	<.001		
PGY2	33 (17.8)	48 (5.7)	.09		
PGY3–4	30 (19.2)	41 (0.0)	.001		
Case 2					
Case to composite goal ignoring appropriate/safe criteria					
All PGY	95 (95.7)	129 (63.2)	<.001°		
PGY1	33 (89.3)	45 (63.9)	.01		
PGY2	33 (100.0)	44 (59.4)	<.001		
PGY3–4	29 (100.0)	40 (65.8)	<.001		
Case to composite goal including appropriate/safe criteria					
All PGY	95 (15.7)	129 (4.7)	.02		
PGY1	33 (22.2)	45 (5.0)	.04		
PGY2	33 (14.4)	44 (2.2)	.08		
PGY3-4	29 (9.7)	40 (7.0)	.67		
Case 3	·				
Case to composite goal ignoring appropriate/safe criteria					
All PGY	92 (82.3)	127 (33.3)	<.001°		

Supplemental digital content for Sperl-Hillen JA, O'Connor PJ, Ekstrom HL, Rush WA, Asche SE, Fernandes OD, Apana D, Amundson GH, Johnson PE, Curran DM. Educating Resident Physicians Using Virtual Case-Based Simulation Improves Diabetes Management: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Acad Med.

PGY1	32 (84.5)	44 (25.5)	<.001
PGY2	32 (96.8)	44 (36.4)	<.001
PGY3–4	28 (62.5)	39 (39.1)	.07
Case to composite goal in	ncluding appropriate/safe	criteria	
All PGY	92 (48.0)	127 (10.4)	<.001°
PGY1	32 (50.6)	44 (7.2)	<.001
PGY2	32 (61.9)	44 (9.1)	<.001
PGY3–4	28 (28.8)	39 (15.3)	.19
Case 4			_
Case to composite goal is	gnoring appropriate/safe o	riteria	
All PGY	90 (96.6)	127 (83.5)	.02
PGY1	32 (90.4)	44 (78.6)	.19
PGY2	32 (100.0)	44 (81.8)	.01
PGY3–4	26 (100.0)	39 (89.9)	.09
Case to composite goal in	ncluding appropriate/safe	criteria	
All PGY	90 (42.1)	127 (18.7)	.002°
PGY1	32 (43.0)	44 (19.3)	.03
PGY2	32 (38.2)	44 (24.9)	.22
PGY3-4	26 (45.4)	39 (11.0)	.005

Abbreviations: PGY = postgraduate year; A1c = glycosylated hemoglobin; BMI = Body Mass Index; SBP = systolic blood pressure; DBP = diastolic blood pressure; CHD = coronary heart disease; LDL = low density lipoprotein; T1DM = type 1 diabetes; T2DM = type 2 diabetes.

^a Criteria for determining appropriate and safe goal achievement are presented in Table 3

^b Proportions and p-values based on generalized linear mixed regression models with adjustment for pre-intervention self-assessed knowledge composite, except where noted.

 $^{^{}c}$ P < .0125, Bonferroni correction for case to composite goal across four cases and case appropriately and safely to goal across four cases.