PRIVATE CONFIDENTIAL

VICTORIAN AUDIT OF SURGICAL MORTALITY

SECOND-LINE ASSESSMENT FORM



Post: GPO Box 2821, Melbourne VIC 3001, Australia Telephone: +61 3 9249 1128 Fax: +61 3 9249 1130

Email: vasm@surgeons.org
Web: www.surgeons.org

TORIAN AUDIT OF SURGICAL MORTALITY

VICTORIAN AUDIT OF SURGICAL MORTALITY (VASM)

GUIDELINES FOR SECOND-LINE ASSESSMENT

INTRODUCTION

VASM has two stages of peer-review assessment:

- 1) First-Line Assessment
- 2) Second-Line Assessment

Stage 2: Second-Line Assessment

A case note review involves a second-line assessor reviewing the case notes (medical records - last admission only) and writing a one-page report. The review is carried out in the spirit of sympathetic enquiry and provides sufficient details for a clear view of events. The report is written in a detached manner and any opinions expressed are objective and reasonable.

Note: The surgeon responsible for patient care is always informed of the findings of the First-Line Assessment and/or Second-Line Assessment in writing.

COMPLETION INSTRUCTIONS

- * To maintain subject confidentiality, never write any patient or consultant identifying information on a Second Line Assessment Form.
- * Always answer all questions.
- * Use only black ink from a ballpoint pen.
- * Print clearly, legibly and accurately within the boxes using block CAPITAL LETTERS.
- * For any descriptive fields, avoid abbreviations.
- * Use date format (DD/MM/YYYY) eg 4th June 2002 is written as 04/06/2002.
- * Use a 24-hour clock when indicating time.
- * Do not leave blank fields. Cross through the field and write 'NA' if not applicable, 'NK' if not known and 'ND' if not done.
- * Never use correction fluid or erase mistakes. Place a single horizontal line through the error. Write correct information beside error. All corrections must be initialled and dated.
- * Any change or correction to a CRF must not obscure the original entry.

By submitting this form to the Mortality Audit, I agree that Australian and New Zealand Audit of Surgical Mortality (ANZASM) may inform the Professional Standards Department of my involvement with the surgical mortality audits, to confirm my compliance with Continuing Professional Development (CPD) requirements.



ROYAL AUSTRALASIAN COLLEGE OF SURGEONS



Study Number						
Office Use						

Second Line Surgical Assessor's Form

	J			
1	First line assessor's comments/questions	to be addressed by seco	ond line assessor in c	ase report
2	Record keeping		Satisfactory Unsati	sfactory Missing
	Medical admission notes			
	Medical follow up notes			
	Procedure notes			
	Case summary letter to GP			
3	If NO OPERATION was performed:			
	Should an operation have been performed?			
	If YES , what operation and why?		Yes No	N/A
	ii 1E3, what operation and why:			
4	Assessor's view (before any surgery) of c	overall risk of death		
	Minimal Small	Moderate	Considerable	Expected
5	Was this patient treated in a critical care should this patient have been provided c	_	on ? Yes (go to Q6	No (continue)
	Intensive Care Unit (ICU)	initioal baro ini	Yes	No
	High Dependency Unit (HDU)		Yes	□ No
	riigii Dependency eriit (1126)			
6	Was the decision on the use of DVT prop	hylaxis appropriate?	Yes No	Don't know
7	Was their balance on issue in this area			
7	Was fluid balance an issue in this case?		Yes No	Don't know

GUIDELINES FOR COMPLETION OF VASM SECOND LINE ASSESSMENT FORM

Thank you for participating in Victorian Audit of Surgical Mortality. The 'Second-Line Assessment' (SLA) form is a standard format used across all Australian states.

Please:

- Answer all questions. It should be noted that if the information provided was not sufficient to reach a conclusion on adequacy of management, a second-line assessment may be recommended to clarify the situation.
- Use not applicable (NA) or 'Don't know' options where appropriate.
- When using abbreviations use standard abbreviations.
- Questions that require a text response should be concise and legible.

By submitting this form to the Mortality Audit, I agree that Australian and New Zealand Audit of Surgical Mortality (ANZASM) may inform the Professional Standards Department of my involvement with the surgical mortality audits, to confirm my compliance with Continuing Professional Development (CPD) requirements.



Study Number						

8	If an OPERATION	WAS PERFOR	RMED:				
	Were there any Area	s forConsidera	tion, Concern or	Adverse E	events in any of the fo	llowing areas:	
			Yes No N/A				Yes No N/A
Pre	-operative managem	nent/preparation	n 🔲 🔲 🔲	Intra-ope	rative/technical mana	gement of surgery	/ 🗌 🗎 🗎
Dec	cision to operate at a	III		Grade/ex	perience of surgeon o	leciding	
Cho	oice of operation			Grade/ex	perience of surgeon o	perating	
	ing of operation late, too soon, wrong	time of day)		Post-ope	rative care		
,	, ,						
	An area for CONSI DIFFERENT, but re				s areas of care COULI e.	D have been IMP	ROVED or
	An area of CONCE	RN is where th	e clinician believ	es that are	eas of care SHOULD h	nave been better.	
	which is sufficiently	serious to lead	to prolonged ho	spitalisatio	edical management ra on or to temporary or partibutes to or causes of	permanent impair	
9a	Were there any ar ADVERSE EVENT				or	Yes	No
9b 1.	Important: please (please describe n		•	events an	d list any other events		
	Area of:	Which:			Was it preventable	? Associated	d with?
	Consideration		lifference to outc		Definitely		Surgical team
	Concern		contributed to de eath of patient wl		Probably		Clinical team
	Adverse Event		be expected to s		Probably not Definitely not	Hospital Other (F	Please specify)
					_		
2.	(please describe the	he second mo	st significant ev	vent)			
	Area of:	Which:			Was it preventable	? Associated	d with?
	Consideration		lifference to outc	ome	Definitely		Surgical team
	Concern		contributed to de		Probably		Clinical team
	Adverse Event		eath of patient wl be expected to s		Probably not Definitely not	Hospital	Please specify)
		ou for whoo	DO OXPOOLOGICO		Delimitery not	Other (F	riease specify)
3.	(please describe tl	he third most :	significant even	nt)			
	Aug = of	VA/In in In .			\\\\-\a\:\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\	Annaista	1:41-0
	Area of: Consideration	Which:	lifference to outc	ome	Was it preventable? Definitely		Surgical team
	Concern		contributed to de		Probably		Clinical team
	Adverse Event	Caused de	eath of patient wh	no would	Probably not	Hospital	
		otnerwise	be expected to s	urvive	Definitely not	Other (F	Please specify)



Study Number

VSCC Case Classific

Preventability of Outcome

In the view of the First line assessment, was the outcome in this case potentially preventable? Please select and circle relevant fields. Multiple fields can be selected.

A - \	Yes, in my view the	outcome was potentially preventable	
V	Failure of communication		
W	Lack of timely involvement	of experienced staff	ī
X	Inadequate resources		Ī
Υ	Protocol breach		
Z	Other (must be specified)		_
1	Preoperative		
1.1	Inadequate preoperative sp	pecific condition investigation	
1.2	Inadequate preoperative go	eneral investigations	
1.3	Incorrect or untimely diagn	osis	
1.4	Inappropriate preoperative	preparation	
1.5	Inappropriate treatment de	lay	
1.6	Other (must be specified)		
2	Intraoperative		
2.1	Personnel issue		
2.2	Facility / equipment issue		
2.3	Other (must be specified)		
3	Postoperative		
3.1	Deficient postoperative car	e	
3.1 3.2	Deficient postoperative car Failure of problem recognit		
3.2	Failure of problem recognit		
3.2	Failure of problem recognit Other (must be specified)	ion	
3.2	Failure of problem recognit Other (must be specified)		
3.2	Failure of problem recognit Other (must be specified)	ion	



The College of Surgeons in Australia and New Zealand VASM thanks you for your participation in this important quality improvement initiative.



Study Number											
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Additional Comments/Feedback:	

VASM audit process

