Data Extraction Items Table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Data Item | Guidance Notes |
| Full Reference (APA) |  |
| Covidence # |  |
| Study ID |  |
| Title |  |
| Country of author affiliations, students, location where conducted |  |
| Objectives/Aim of Study |  |
| Terminology used regarding sim | This is for us to collect different terminology used. please also include the definitions used. what did the author(s) use in their article and how did they define it?) |
| Terminology used regarding distance sim |  |
| Professions of Educators/Researchers identified through credentials, affiliations, or text | (write not mentioned even if you know the authors) |
| Discipline of Educators/Researchers identified through credentials, affiliations, or text | (write not mentioned even if you know the authors) |
| Composition of development team | (if mentioned and different than above, if same: “same”) |
| Composition of implementation team | (if mentioned and different than above, if same: “same”) |
| Were the researchers blinded to participants |  |
| If mentioned, what faculty, simulation, or researcher development training was provided | (if yes, please indicate "other" and describe in note) |
| Sample size |  |
| Were the study participants randomized |  |
| Professions |  |
| Profession/Program |  |
| Experience Level |  |
| Grade/Experience Level | (describe) – describe e.g. mostly novice, graduating, first year, employee,mix |
| Participation in simulation activity |  |
| Team composition in simulation |  |
| Team participation in activity was interprofessional |  |
| Team composition in debriefing |  |
| Study Design |  |
| Theoretical Framework |  |
| Location of study |  |
| Recruitment description |  |
| For Mixed-Distance, was conducted as | Sequential (e.g. in person, then distance, then in person)Simulation-specific event hybrid |
| Was this research | ON simulation (studying simulation as a method of modality)USING simulation ) studying another topic through the use of sim)(If the answer is both, please indicate “other” and describe) |
| Did the intervention include simulation |  |
| If an experimental design, what differed? What was being studied? |  |
| If a comparison arm utilized a different simulation modality, please indicate the modality here. |  |
| Simulation modalities used in education | ( meaning – education material using sim to support the research) (select all – Some studies may use simulation as part of the education but not directly part of the actual research – indicate here) |
| What type(s) was(were) used | (e.g. “Leardal SimMan 3G”, name of virtual world, “360-degree videos” etc) |
| How was the distance element achieved |  |
| Details of scenario |  |
| Was there a debrief |  |
| Was a specific debriefing method mentioned? |  |
| Details and structure of debriefing if incorporated | (examples: Which method was used? Was the debriefing structured or semi-structured? Was video used? Which parts were in-person/at a distance? Who conducted the debriefing?) |
| Was a pictogram used (Education) |  |
| Details and structure of event flow (of the education) | (if explained by text) |
| Was a pictogram used (Research) |  |
| Details and structure of event flow (of the research) | (if explained by text) |
| What type of measures were chosen | (describe names of measures, why were they chosen, how were they adapted, this includes statistical measures as well) |
| Was the validity of the measurement tools reported |  |
| Was the reliability of measurement tools reported |  |
| Was interrater reliability of raters using the tool reported |  |
| Details of any assessment or program evaluation | (name of evaluation framework if reported) |
| Adverse events mentioned by authors |  |
| Generalizability | In your opinion, are the results generalizable to the larger population? If no, why not? |
| Themes identified by authors | e.g. if they have chosen just a part of the results to be included AND they list other themes/results. Note if there is a table. |
| Kirkpatrick level | (if there are no outcomes, should be excluded; does not need to be explicitly reported, please assign level of outcomes) select all <https://www.kirkpatrickpartners.com/the-kirkpatrick-model/>Level 1: Reactions (Did you enjoy this? The degree to which participants find the training favorable, engaging, and relevant to their jobs)Level 2: Knowledge, Skills, Attitudes (change in attitude), & Other (how task is done?) (The degree to which participants acquire the intended knowledge, skills, attitude, confidence, and commitment based on their participation in the training)Level 3: Behavioral (change in behaviors, the degree to which participants apply what they learned during training when they are back on the job)Level 4: Translational/Patient Outcome (The degree to which targeted outcomes occur as a result of the training and the support and accountability package)Level 5: Systems/Organization/Team Measures/ROI/Employee Satisfaction/Care (not original kirkpatrick–only if this is reported, there is controversy in literature as to what level 5 is) |
| What were the outcomes/findings | (note if there is a table) |
| Simulation factors that may have led to positive outcomes identified by authors |  |
| Simulation factors that may have led to negative outcomes identified by authors |  |
| Implications identified |  |
| Challenges encountered during research and reported by authors |  |
| Strengths of study design as reported by authors |  |
| Other strengths of study design as assessed by you and not reported in article |  |
| Limitations as reported by authors |  |
| Other limitations as assessed by you and not reported in article |  |
| Areas of future study identified by authors |  |
| Did they mention that the studies were registered |  |
| Did they mention if there were protocols approved or published prior to study |  |
| Was this submitted for IRB/ethics board review |  |
| Was there funding for this study | F YES, please indicate "other" and describe funding |
| Did the authors state that reporting guidelines were used |  |
| Were other reporting guidelines used | (If Yes, use Other and write which guidelines used) |
| QUALITY ASSESSMENT |
| Tool Used | RCT (CASP)Systematic Review (CASP)Qualitative (CASP)Cohort (CASP)Diagnostic (CASP)Case Control (CASP)Clinical Prediction (CASP)Economic Evaluation (CASP)Before & After with no control (NIH)Other |
| Total Yes’s | *Extractors will also be able to add supporting text to justify their judgements* |
| Total number of items on tool used | *Extractors will also be able to add supporting text to justify their judgements* |
| Overall Appraisal | Quality is good, findings credible = includeQuality is not good, findings not credible = do not include |
| Overall Appraisal supporting text | *Extractors will also be able to add supporting text to justify their judgements* |
|  |  |
|  |  |