

Discussions about Goals of Care in the Emergency Department: a Qualitative Study of Emergency Physicians' Opinions Using the Normalization Process Theory

Fannie Péloquin MD ⁽¹⁾, Emile Marmen LL.B, MD ^(1,4), Véronique Gélinas MSc⁽²⁾, Ariane Plaisance PhD^(3,5), Maude Linteau BA⁽⁴⁾, Audrey Nolet MD ^(1,4), Nathalie Germain BA⁽⁴⁾, Patrick Archambault MD, MSc ^(1,2,4,5)

(1) Department of Family Medicine and Emergency Medicine, Université Laval, Québec, Canada

(2) Centre intégré en santé et en services sociaux de Chaudière-Appalaches, Lévis, Canada

(3) Sciences de la santé, Université du Québec à Rimouski, Lévis, Québec, Canada

(4) Centre de recherche intégrée pour un système apprenant en santé et services sociaux de Chaudière-Appalaches, Lévis, Québec, Canada

(5) VITAM - Centre de recherche en santé durable, Québec, Québec, Canada

Keywords

Goals of care discussions (GCD), Advanced care planning, Emergency Medicine, Qualitative research, Normalization Process Theory

Abstract

Purpose

We explored emergency department (ED) physicians' opinions about the feasibility of leading goals of care discussions (GCD) in their daily practice.

Method

This qualitative study was based on the Normalization Process Theory (NPT). We conducted semi-structured interviews between April and May 2018 with a convenience sample of ten emergency physicians from one academic ED (Lévis, Canada) and aimed to reach data saturation. Using a mixed deductive and inductive thematic analysis, two authors codified the interviews under the four NPT constructs: coherence, cognitive participation, collective action, and reflexive monitoring. We calculated a kappa statistic to measure inter-rater agreement.

Results

We interviewed 10 emergency physicians. No new ideas emerged after the ninth interview and the inter-rater agreement was substantial. Fourteen themes were identified as factors influencing the feasibility of implementing GCD: (1) interpersonal communication, (2) efficiency of care, (3) anxiety generated by the discussion, (4) identification of an acute deterioration leading to the GCD, (5) meeting of the clinician, patient, and family, (6) importance of knowing the patient's goals of care before medical handover, (7) lack of training, (8) availability of protocols, (9) heterogeneous prioritization for leading GCD, (10) need to take action before patients consult in the ED, (11) need to develop education programs, (12) need for legislation, (13) need to improve the ED environment and human resources, and (14) selective systematization of GCD for patients.

Conclusion

Goals of care discussions are possible and essential with selected ED patients. Physicians identified outstanding needs to normalize GCD in their practice: education for both themselves and patients on the concept of GCD, legislative action for the systematization of GCD for patients, and proactive documentation of patients' preferences pre-ED. Patient, clinician and system-level policy-making efforts remain necessary to address these needs and ensure the normalization of GCD in emergency physicians' daily practice as suggested by clinical guidelines.

Clinician's capsule

1. What is known about the topic?

Goals of care discussions are important to provide care aligned with patients' values and medical preferences.

2. What did this study ask?

According to emergency physicians, are goals of care discussions feasible in the emergency department?

3. What did this study find?

Goals of care discussions are essential and possible if patient, clinician and system-level policymaking structured efforts are deployed.

4. Why does this study matter to clinicians?

This study identified action items to improve the implementation and quality of goals of care discussions in the emergency department.

Introduction

Canada is facing a significant challenge with its aging population, putting pressure on provincial health systems nationwide to respond to an increasing prevalence of age-related illnesses [1]. Unfortunately, increasing numbers of non-beneficial aggressive life-sustaining therapies are also being used near the end of life [2]. Despite this increase in health service use, older adults prioritize their comfort and home-based care near their end-of-life [3]. Experts recommend that acute care professionals improve the frequency and quality of their goals of care discussions (GCD) with older adult patients [4]. GCD allow for health professionals to provide care congruent to patient values and to improve end-of-life care [5]. The emergency department (ED) is a unique environment where time pressures, lack of human resources, overcrowding, and lack of access to important background health information are barriers to establishing a trustful relationship with patients [6–8]. Health organizations across Canada have made recommendations to support and lead earlier and better GCD with older adult patients [9]. In Québec, the *Institut National d'excellence en santé et en services sociaux (INESSS)* has published guidelines recommending emergency physicians to establish goals of care with selected patients [10,11]. In 2016, the guidelines introduced a standardized GCD form featuring four goals of care, and an iterative model to support the implementation of an interprofessional GCD process in all health and social services organizations across the province. A 2024 update to this guideline describes three goals of care but is undergoing pilot testing in select centers and the four-goal model is still widely used [11]. Considering these provincial guidelines, this study aimed to explore emergency physicians' opinions about leading GCD in their ED with targeted patients.

Methods

Study Design and Time period

This study was a cross-sectional qualitative study of ED physicians' opinions about leading GCD based on the Normalization Process Theory (NPT) [12]. The NPT is a middle-range theory used to explain the sustainability of implementing complex healthcare interventions. We conducted interviews between April and May 2018. This project was approved by the CISSS-CA research ethics board (2018-487) and informed consent was obtained for all participants. We report our results using the Standard for Reporting Qualitative Research guidelines (SRQR) [13] (See [Appendix 1](#)).

Study Setting

The study was conducted in a single academic ED (Hôtel-Dieu de Lévis) in Lévis, Québec, Canada, which is part of the *Centre intégré de santé et de services sociaux de Chaudière-Appalaches (CISSS-CA)*.

Population and Sample Size

After presenting the project at a departmental meeting, we sent an email invitation to all emergency physicians in the department ($n = 31$) to participate on a voluntary basis. Those interested contacted the primary author. We established the sample size using an estimation of the number of participants needed to reach theoretical data saturation [14]. We recruited a convenience sample of ten participants, allowing for the recruitment of additional participants if data saturation was not obtained.

Data Collection and Analysis

Data collection and analysis was led by a six-person team composed of an emergency medicine resident interested in GCD (FP), one medical student with a law degree (EM) and another medical student with palliative care experience (AN), a PhD student with experience in advance care planning and in applying the NPT (AP) [15,16], a research coordinator with experience in qualitative research (VG) [17] and an emergency physician with experience in qualitative research (PA) [18,19]. Interviews were led by FP who had previously collaborated with the participants as a trainee, contributing to a climate of trust and openness among the participants. This also allowed the interviewer to have firsthand experience of the context in which the participants lead GCD.

She conducted semi-structured interviews (40 to 90 minutes) over the phone or in-person with participants based on their preference. All interviews were audio recorded. The interview guide was based on the four constructs of the NPT: coherence, cognitive participation, collective action, and reflexive monitoring [12] (See [Appendix 2](#)). Coherence refers to the sense-making done individually and collectively when faced with the operationalization of a new practice. Cognitive participation is the relational work done to build and sustain a community of practice around a new complex intervention. Collective action is the operational work done to enact a complex healthcare intervention. Reflexive monitoring is appraisal work that is done to assess and understand the ways that a new set of practices affect oneself and others [12].

The primary author (FP) and two other authors (EM, VG) then conducted a thematic analysis guided by the work of Braun and Clarke [20]. We audio recorded interviews and transcribed them verbatim. Using NVivo software (version 12.0), two authors (FP, EM) independently codified the content of each interview and generated initial codes. At first, codes were deductively identified using the NPT constructs. However, not all elements from the interviews fit neatly into the NPT framework, and subsequently the text was then inductively coded to enrich the analysis. The same two authors (FP, EM) used the constant comparative method to discuss their coding and content interpretation. A third author (VG) resolved any disagreements. Cohen's kappa statistic was calculated to measure inter-rater agreement for coding. When agreement was unsatisfactory ($\text{kappa} <$

.7) [21], FP and EM deliberated coding again to reach consensus. As coding progressed, the team iteratively searched for prevalent themes within each construct. The prevalence of a theme was determined according to its frequency within the interview transcripts. Themes were reviewed and underwent refinement of their definitions throughout the analytic process.

Results

We interviewed 10 ED physicians (50 % women; 60% certified in Emergency Medicine by the College of Family Physicians of Canada (See [Table 1](#)).

Table 1. Characteristics of participating physicians.

	Count
Gender	
Male	5
Female	5
Years of practice	
0-5	2
5-10	3
10-20	3
More than 20	2
Medical training	
Family medicine with complementary training in emergency medicine, CCMF	6
Emergency medicine specialty, FRCPC	4
Palliative care training	0
Frequency of Goals of Care Discussions	
Every shift	1
A few times per month	4
Many times per month	5
Almost never	0

Data saturation was obtained after the ninth interview. Inter-rater agreement of the coding was substantial ($\kappa = .72$). We identified thirteen themes related to the four NPT constructs that ED physicians consider important about leading GCD with their patients (See [Table 2](#)).

Coherence

We identified six themes related to the construct of coherence (See [Table 2](#) for all constructs, themes, and examples for each).

Interpersonal communication: All participants (n = 10) defined GCD as the verbal interactions between a physician and a patient or surrogate decision maker capable of discussing the patient's wishes and expectations about end-of-life care, particularly about the limitations or lack of limitations guiding care decisions about investigations and/or treatments. This discussion allows the patient, or surrogate decision maker and the treating physician to establish a mutual understanding about the desired care in anticipated medical situations. However, most participants (n = 6) indicated facing difficulties explaining the exact difference between the four goals of care on the INESSS form ([Appendix 3](#)), which raises the question of whether dividing the goals of care into four categories is helpful or detrimental to the discussion.

Participants explained how they communicated with their patients during GCD. Some (n = 2) approach goals of care, resuscitation, and endotracheal intubation independently, while others include all these discussion topics in the same discussion (n = 1). Most (n = 6) approach the discussion using a directive informed assent approach by suggesting interventions and treatments according to the goal of care they identified as appropriate after reviewing the patient's comorbidities. Emergency physicians then clarify their reasoning with the patient and specify that the patient's values and expressed preferences lead to a reconsideration of the suggested GCD.

Efficiency of care: GCD was acknowledged by all participants (n = 10) as an important process in the delivery of efficient care. A GCD guides the medical team in defining the orientation of care and ensures that patients' values, goals, and expectations surrounding end-of-life care are taken into consideration. It also allows patients to express their preferences to their family. Participants also suggested that goals of care discussions lead to optimal resource use and reduction of costs in the health system by preventing the use of non-beneficial treatments.

Anxiety generated by the discussion: Physicians' and patients' anxiety were identified as a barrier to leading GCD in the ED (n = 9). ED physicians mentioned that the lack of time was a main source of concern. Another important source of concern and moral distress for our participants was when patients expressed unrealistic expectations about their prognosis or the benefit of certain aggressive life-sustaining therapies. According to our participants, patients may also face moral distress when family members express discordant values and preferences concerning the patient's goals of care. Some physicians (n = 2) also felt that patients may even fear being abandoned if they decide on less aggressive goals of care. Others (n = 4) also expressed concerns that these discussions might induce guilt in family members.

Identification of an acute deterioration leading to the GCD: When questioned about how they prioritize which patient would benefit from a GCD, all participants (n = 10) stated that they assess the risk of acute deterioration to guide whether they should engage in a GCD with their patient. Our participants stated that they also use the patient's characteristics, such as a patient's age, frailty, and comorbidities to help them decide whether to engage in GCD. For stable patients who will be hospitalized, most ED physicians (n = 6) defer the GCD to the consulting treating team. However, a few participants (n = 4) mentioned engaging in GCD with chronic terminally ill patients who frequently visit the ED and for which treatment options are running out. The participants stated that GCD were not required for stable patients presenting a benign complaint and for patients where maximal care was unequivocal (e.g., young and healthy patients). For patients unable to consent without any available representative, participants make every effort to contact a substitute decision maker, but unfortunately urgent decisions sometimes need to be made for these patients without any guidance from a previous GCD.

Meeting between clinicians, patients and family / the importance of knowing the patients' goals of care before medical handover: According to all our participants (n = 10), two major factors influence the timing to start the discussion of a GCD. The first is when a clinician, a patient and family members meet in the ED and the second is knowing the patient's goals of care before end-of-shift medical handover. Also, if the patient's condition is unstable and urgent critical care is needed or if the patient may soon lose their capacity to consent, ED physicians will initiate a GCD as soon as possible.

Cognitive participation

We identified two themes related to the construct of cognitive participation.

Lack of training: Nearly all (n = 9) participants highlighted a lack of training on the standardized INESSS goals of care form (See [Appendix 3](#)) implemented in 2016.

Availability of protocols: In the case that palliative care is chosen as a patient's preferred option during the GCD, participants mentioned that an end-of-life respiratory distress care protocol helps standardize care and ensures patient-centered transitions between acute care and hospice in addition to palliative care. Also, one participant mentioned that the electronic order entry system built-in with the ED information system (i.e., Med-Urge, *MédiaMed Technologies*, Mont-Sainte-Hilaire, Québec) allows physicians to indicate and inform all care team members about patients' preferred goals of care.

Collective action

We only identified one theme under the construct of collective action.

Heterogeneous prioritization for leading GCD: Collectively, engagement towards GCD is a heterogeneous priority among various ED stakeholders. Participants agreed that this intervention is supported and encouraged by the team of ED physicians, but oversight and disengagement are still frequent. According to our ED physician participants, the nursing team is an invaluable ally for GCD. The nursing team to the same degree expresses interest in being included in determining goals of care to allow continuity and congruence of care with the patient's desires. Some participants (n = 4) mentioned that certain medical specialties (e.g., respirology and cardiology) conduct more GCD with their terminally ill patients than other specialties. For example, some participants (n = 4) pointed to a frequent discrepancy between the palliative nature of certain oncology treatments and the patient's lack of understanding of the incurable nature of certain terminal cancer conditions. They also criticized the frequent lack of documented GCD with many terminally ill oncology patients. Moreover, participants perceived that hospital administrators were working to facilitate GCD but did not consider GCD as their main priority.

Reflexive monitoring

We identified five themes under the construct of reflexive monitoring.

Need to take action before patients consult in the ED: ED physicians (n = 8) suggested to encourage collaboration in GCD between primary care professionals, ED physicians and other hospital physicians. The objective of which is to promote the use of goals of care in pre-hospital care and to include routine GCD in regular follow-up visits with primary care physicians.

Need to develop education programs: Participants (n = 8) mentioned the need to improve the population's general understanding of GCD, to offer medical training on GCD, end-of-life care and care trajectories, and to standardize the approach to leading GCD.

Need for legislation and selective systematization of GCD for patients: ED physicians (n = 4) suggested including documentation about a patient's goals of care in the provincial *Dossier Santé Québec*, in notarized documents, signed on their health insurance card, and in the patient's hospital record. In addition, physicians should be required to lead GCD in public and private long-term care facilities, and when caring for high-risk populations such as oncology patients and patients being admitted to hospital.

Need to improve the ED environment and human resources: Participants (n = 4) proposed to implement a psychology service in the ED and to promote adapted physical premises for GCD.

Selective intervention: To optimize the implementation of GCD, participants (n = 9) suggested defining and systematizing the selection of patients that are the most likely to benefit from GCD.

Discussion

We aimed to explore emergency physicians' opinions about the feasibility of leading GCD in their daily practice as suggested by clinical guidelines. Using the Normalization Process Theory (NPT), we identified positive and negative factors influencing the feasibility of leading GCD in the ED.

ED physicians interviewed during this study understand the principles of GCD and recognized that this practice is well-established and should be a part of their standard medical practice. According to the NPT, implementation can be facilitated if healthcare professionals understand the intervention and its importance. Our participants also recognized that care efficiency can be improved when conducting GCD appropriately. ED physicians valued the improved transitions in care and quality of care due to earlier and better GCD in the ED. Above all, early and high quality GCD are beneficial for patients and their family by improving end-of-life care, reducing anxiety, and avoiding unnecessary interventions [5]. A transition towards palliative care when appropriate is also associated with reductions in hospital costs, fewer ED visits, shorter hospitalizations and fewer hospital deaths [8,22,23].

Even if GCD were generally well perceived and that participants were willing to implement this practice, several sources of improvement are required before GCD can be fully and efficiently implemented in the ED. Similar to previous systematic reviews [24] and ED-specific studies [25], our results suggest that GCD can be done in the ED. Similar to other work [25,26], we also identified barriers specific to the ED context that hinder GCD. Anxiety, time constraints, moral distress, absent family members, and lack of training and gaps in information continuity between primary, secondary, and tertiary care all contribute to avoidance of GCD in the ED. A multiprofessional approach may alleviate some of this distress by allowing patients and their families to address unrealistic expectations of prognosis or difficult emotions arising from moral distress [27]. Such professionals could also serve as mediators or neutral third parties in navigating and negotiating terms of GCD with patients.

In their interviews, our participants highlighted the absence of standardized techniques to approach GCD along with variation in the identification of patients requiring GCD as barriers. As such, ED physicians approach the task of GCD relying on their values and preferences, which may contribute to a heterogeneous GCD practice. ED physicians in our study used an informed assent approach in which they limit options presented to patients, like 'nudging' patients to make decisions based on ethically acceptable options

[28]. Existing resources could also be used to standardize an informed assent approach. Other authors suggest communication models [22] such as the SILVER method [29], the SPIKES model [30], the Serious Illness Conversation Guide [31–33], and the communication course for emergency physicians developed by Grudzen and colleagues [34] as tools to help GCD implementation through effective physician-patient communication and physician’s behaviors while approaching and discussing GCD. The communication aspect of GCD is a determining factor in end-of-life care because it allows for diagnosis, treatment, and prognosis comprehension in addition to the reduction of traumatic stress for family and next of kin [5]. Patient perceptions of cardiovascular resuscitation are often incomplete and as such, physicians in collaboration with broader interprofessional teams [35] must explain the medical implications of those interventions [36] while balancing the uncertainty of a patient’s prognosis [7,25].

Other clinical tools exist to support physicians in their decision to get involved in a GCD, such as the surprise question: “Would you be surprised if this patient died within the next 30 days?” [37] or the PREDICT score helping physicians systematically identify patients who would benefit from GCD [38]. Populational and professional education programs about GCD were also considered to be a potential facilitator for both physicians and allied professionals. For instance, the Education in Palliative and End-of-life Care for Emergency Medicine (EPEC-EM) course and The Improving Palliative care in Emergency Medicine Project offer resources to integrate end-of-life care in daily ED medical practice [39]. Early exposure to the concept of GCD and advance care planning among long-term care residents and their relatives may improve care transitions for long-term care patients to EDs [40].

In addition to using tools to facilitate the standardization of GCD, system-level change must occur to facilitate the implementation of these interventions. Interprofessional collaboration is a prerequisite because GCD cannot be performed with every ED patient. Routine and systematic GCD by primary care providers supported by better information continuity between healthcare teams poses one solution [25]. Engaging and empowering primary care providers to lead GCD can lead to higher quality and earlier GCD, more home-based end-of-life care, and fewer ED visits [27]. Participants voiced their desire for increased support from interprofessional teams and certain specialists, and better access to palliative care teams. Some delegation of responsibilities has occurred: since 2021, nurse practitioners in Québec can complete goals of care with their patients [41].

An increased access to adequate and timely GCD will necessitate collective social action initiatives. Although the Québec government instituted the Act Respecting End-of-Life Care in 2015 [42], some participants called for additional legal reforms that would mandate that organizations like long-term care institutions bear some responsibility to document GCD for their patients. Since the COVID-19 pandemic, governmental

initiatives have increased the support for more complete and earlier GCD before patients arrive in the ED and face potentially difficult decisions [41].

In February 2024, the INESSS updated their recommendations about GCD [11]. Some recommendations propose changes relevant to the points raised by our participants. First is the simplification of the form to three non-hierarchical categories (i.e., Prolongation (P), Equilibrium (E), and Comfort (C)) instead of four hierarchical levels of care (i.e., A (Prolong life with all necessary care), B (Prolong life with some limitations to care), C (Ensure comfort as a priority over prolonging life), and D (Ensure comfort without prolonging life)). While Prolongation and Comfort are distinct, there is a considerable gray area when considering Equilibrium. INESSS recommends that information pertinent to choosing this goal of care should be documented clearly and in advance to guide the care team in an emergency situation. INESSS has also recommended the initiation of GCD throughout care, especially as soon as a serious chronic diagnosis is identified, but also including high-risk acute situations and hospital admissions, in alignment with the perceptions of our participating ED physicians. The INESSS recommendations currently do not provide a detailed overview of practices to identify specific field issues, recommend actions, nor propose monitoring indicators.

ED physicians in our study positively perceived GCD, despite identifying important constraints in practice. Future studies will be needed to investigate how other ED healthcare professionals such as nurses and social workers [31] can support earlier and better GCD in the ED. Continuous monitoring of the frequency and quality of GCD in the ED will be essential to support ongoing quality improvement and sustainable change in these interventions.

Limitations and Strengths

Our study has limitations. This study is monocentric, and thereby influenced by the specific characteristics of the local culture and community. Using a convenience sample of motivated ED physicians engaged in improving goals of care discussions in the ED may indicate a selection bias. Their interest and dedication allowed us to collect rich insights in improving GCD.

This study also has strengths. We used a well-documented and tested methodological approach [12] to analyze a complex and prevalent implementation problem across Canada [25,43]. Our results accord with current national and international scientific literature. Using the NPT may allow other investigators to use our results and compare them to diverse cultural, organizational, and legal contexts. Our qualitative analysis of a complex intervention allowed us to expand on solutions with participating physicians to improve the implementation and sustainability of high-quality goals of care discussions in the ED.

Clinical implications:

This study identified facilitating factors for implementation of GCD in the everyday practice for ED physicians. Physicians suggested educating patients on the concept of GCD, imposing legislation on the selective systematization of GCD for patients, and ideally delegating the documentation of patients' preferences to primary care before any visit to the ED. Other suggestions included training ED physicians on efficient use of the tool, encompassing professional support and institutional prioritization in practicing these discussions. Considering our results, more institutional and provincial support is needed to implement immediate actions aiming to normalize GCD in the ED and pre-ED.

Research implications:

Emergency physicians believe that it is essential to clarify goals of care with specific ED patients. Easy to access quality indicators are needed to document the quality and monitor the frequency of GCD in the ED.

Conclusion:

Goals of care discussions are possible and essential with selected patients in the ED. Nevertheless, clinician-level, collective and policy-making efforts remain essential to ensure the implementation of clinical guideline recommendations.

Acknowledgements

We thank all participants who generously accepted to participate in this study.

Financial support

This research received internal funding from the Department of Family and Emergency Medicine, Université Laval.

Conflict of interest

None.

Authors' contributions

FP and PA obtained funding for the study from the Department of Family and Emergency Medicine, Université Laval. This study was also supported by an Embedded Clinician Salary Award (ECRA) awarded to PA from the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR) (#201603) and a Fonds de recherche du Québec – Santé (FRQS) Senior Clinical Scholar Award (#283211). FP, AP and PA designed the study. FP, EM and VG collected and interpreted the data. FP and VG wrote the paper with input from all authors. AN

reviewed the manuscript and translated the verbatims from French to English. ML and NG critically reviewed the manuscript and provided improvements to the manuscript. The study findings and final manuscript were critically revised and approved by all authors. The study findings and final manuscript were critically revised and approved by all authors.

References

1. Government of Canada SC. Life expectancy and other elements of the complete life table, three-year estimates, Canada, all provinces except Prince Edward Island [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Jun 2]. Available from: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tb11/en/tv.action?pid=1310011401>
2. Cardona-Morrell M, Kim J, Turner RM, Anstey M, Mitchell IA, Hillman K. Non-beneficial treatments in hospital at the end of life: a systematic review on extent of the problem. *Int J Qual Health Care J Int Soc Qual Health Care*. 2016 Sep;28(4):456–69.
3. Fowler R, Hammer M. End-of-life care in Canada. *Clin Investig Med Med Clin Exp*. 2013 Jun 1;36(3):E127-132.
4. Heyland DK, Barwich D, Pichora D, Dodek P, Lamontagne F, You JJ, et al. Failure to engage hospitalized elderly patients and their families in advance care planning. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2013 May 13;173(9):778–87.
5. Detering KM, Hancock AD, Reade MC, Silvester W. The impact of advance care planning on end of life care in elderly patients: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2010 Mar 24;340:c1345.
6. Simon JR, Kraus C, Rosenberg M, Wang DH, Clayborne EP, Derse AR. “Futile Care”—An Emergency Medicine Approach: Ethical and Legal Considerations. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2017 Nov 1;70(5):707–13.
7. Chan GK. End-of-life models and emergency department care. *Acad Emerg Med Off J Soc Acad Emerg Med*. 2004 Jan;11(1):79–86.
8. Wu FM, Newman JM, Lasher A, Brody AA. Effects of initiating palliative care consultation in the emergency department on inpatient length of stay. *J Palliat Med*. 2013 Nov;16(11):1362–7.
9. Bernard C, Tan A, Slaven M, Elston D, Heyland DK, Howard M. Exploring patient-reported barriers to advance care planning in family practice. *BMC Fam Pract*. 2020 May 25;21(1):94.
10. Boothroyd L, Rossignol M, Bouchard S. Les niveaux de soins : cadre, processus et méthodes d’élaboration du guide sur les normes et standards de qualité [Internet]. Québec, Québec: Institut national d’excellence en santé et en services sociaux (Québec); 2016 [cited 2024 Jul 6] p. 52. Available from: <http://collections.banq.qc.ca/ark:/52327/2977318>
11. Côté S, Lamy S, Gilbert S, Magron A, Gagné V, Turcotte C, et al. Expression des volontés au regard des objectifs de soins et de la décision relative à la réanimation cardiorespiratoire [Internet]. Québec, Qc: l’Institut national d’excellence en santé et en services sociaux (INESSS); 2024 [cited 2024 Jul 8]. 66 p. (Direction de l’évaluation et de la pertinence des modes d’intervention en santé; vol. 2). Available from: https://www.inesss.qc.ca/fileadmin/doc/INESSS/Rapports/OrganisationsSoins/INESSS_Objectifs_soins_Avis.pdf

12. Murray E, Treweek S, Pope C, MacFarlane A, Ballini L, Dowrick C, et al. Normalisation process theory: a framework for developing, evaluating and implementing complex interventions. *BMC Med*. 2010 Oct 20;8(1):63.
13. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. *Acad Med J Assoc Am Med Coll*. 2014 Sep;89(9):1245–51.
14. Savoie-Zajc L. L'entrevue semi-dirigée. In: Gauthier B, editor. *Recherche sociale: de la problématique à la collecte des données* [Internet]. 4th ed. Québec, Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec; 2003 [cited 2024 Jul 8]. p. 293–316. Available from: <https://www.deslibris.ca/ID/432313>
15. Plaisance A, Witteman HO, LeBlanc A, Kryworuchko J, Heyland DK, Ebell MH, et al. Development of a decision aid for cardiopulmonary resuscitation and invasive mechanical ventilation in the intensive care unit employing user-centered design and a wiki platform for rapid prototyping. *PLOS ONE*. 2018 Feb 15;13(2):e0191844.
16. Plaisance A, Heyland DK, Laflamme B, Morin M, Pageau F, Girard A, et al. Using Normalisation Process Theory to explore an interprofessional approach to Goals of Care: a qualitative study of stakeholders' perspectives. *Mortality*. 2023 Feb 23;0(0):1–14.
17. Ghandour EK, Lelaidier Hould L, Fortier FA, Gélinas V, Melnick ER, Hess EP, et al. Adapting two American Decision Aids for Mild Traumatic Brain Injury to the Canadian Context Using the Nominal Group Technique. *Patient - Patient-Centered Outcomes Res*. 2020 Dec 1;13(6):729–43.
18. Archambault PM, Thanh J, Blouin D, Gagnon S, Poitras J, Fountain RM, et al. Emergency medicine residents' beliefs about contributing to an online collaborative slideshow. *CJEM*. 2015 Jul;17(4):374–86.
19. Archambault PM, Bilodeau A, Gagnon MP, Aubin K, Lavoie A, Lapointe J, et al. Health care professionals' beliefs about using wiki-based reminders to promote best practices in trauma care. *J Med Internet Res*. 2012 Apr 19;14(2):e49.
20. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol*. 2006 Jan;3(2):77–101.
21. McHugh ML. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochem Medica*. 2012 Oct 15;22(3):276–82.
22. Limehouse WE, Feeser VR, Bookman KJ, Derse A. A model for emergency department end-of-life communications after acute devastating events--part I: decision-making capacity, surrogates, and advance directives. *Acad Emerg Med Off J Soc Acad Emerg Med*. 2012 Sep;19(9):E1068-1072.
23. Limehouse WE, Feeser VR, Bookman KJ, Derse A. A model for emergency department end-of-life communications after acute devastating events--part II: moving from resuscitative to end-of-life or palliative treatment. *Acad Emerg Med Off J Soc Acad Emerg Med*. 2012 Nov;19(11):1300–8.

24. Hanning J, Walker KJ, Horrigan D, Levinson M, Mills A. Review article: Goals-of-care discussions for adult patients nearing end of life in emergency departments: A systematic review. *Emerg Med Australas EMA*. 2019 Aug;31(4):525–32.
25. Argintaru N, Quinn KL, Chartier LB, Lee J, Hannam P, O'Connor E, et al. Perceived barriers and facilitators to goals of care discussions in the emergency department: A descriptive analysis of the views of emergency medicine physicians and residents. *CJEM*. 2019 Mar;21(2):211–8.
26. Ouchi K, George N, Schuur JD, Aaronson EL, Lindvall C, Bernstein E, et al. Goals-of-Care Conversations for Older Adults With Serious Illness in the Emergency Department: Challenges and Opportunities. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2019 Aug;74(2):276–84.
27. Litzelman DK, Inui TS, Griffin WJ, Perkins A, Cottingham AH, Schmitt-Wendholt KM, et al. Impact of Community Health Workers on Elderly Patients' Advance Care Planning and Health Care Utilization: Moving the Dial. *Med Care*. 2017 Apr;55(4):319–26.
28. Blumenthal-Barby JS, Cantor SB, Russell HV, Naik AD, Volk RJ. Decision aids: when “nudging” patients to make a particular choice is more ethical than balanced, nondirective content. *Health Aff Proj Hope*. 2013 Feb;32(2):303–10.
29. Fernandez R, Deutsch AL, Janairo MP, Compton SA. Development of a content valid tool for assessing end-of-life communication in acute care settings. *J Palliat Med*. 2012 Apr;15(4):381–7.
30. McEwan A, Silverberg JZ. Palliative Care in the Emergency Department. *Emerg Med Clin North Am*. 2016 Aug;34(3):667–85.
31. Aaronson EL, Greenwald JL, Krenzel LR, Rogers AM, LaPointe L, Jacobsen JC. Adapting the serious illness conversation guide for use in the emergency department by social workers. *Palliat Support Care*. 2021 Dec;19(6):681–5.
32. Izumi SS, Caron D, Guay-Bélanger S, Archambault P, Michaels L, Heinlein J, et al. Development and Evaluation of Serious Illness Conversation Training for Interprofessional Primary Care Teams. *J Palliat Med*. 2023 Sep;26(9):1198–206.
33. Souza LG, Archambault P, Bouba DA, Dofara SG, Guay-Bélanger S, Ghio SC, et al. Impact of a team-based versus individual clinician-focused training approach on primary healthcare professionals' intention to have serious illness conversations with patients: a theory informed process evaluation of a cluster randomized trial [Internet]. *medRxiv*; 2024 [cited 2024 Jul 8]. p. 2024.02.05.24302368. Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.02.05.24302368v1>
34. Grudzen CR, Emler LL, Kuntz J, Shreves A, Zimny E, Gang M, et al. EM Talk: communication skills training for emergency medicine patients with serious illness. *BMJ Support Palliat Care*. 2016 Jun;6(2):219–24.

35. Lakin JR, Benotti E, Paladino J, Henrich N, Sanders J. Interprofessional Work in Serious Illness Communication in Primary Care: A Qualitative Study. *J Palliat Med.* 2019 Jul;22(7):751–63.
36. Abramson N, de Vos R, Fallat ME, Finucane T, Kettler D, Pepe P, et al. Ethics in emergency cardiac care. *Ann Emerg Med.* 2001 Apr 1;37(4, Part B):S196–200.
37. Haydar SA, Almeder L, Michalakes L, Han PKJ, Strout TD. Using the Surprise Question To Identify Those with Unmet Palliative Care Needs in Emergency and Inpatient Settings: What Do Clinicians Think? *J Palliat Med.* 2017 Jul;20(7):729–35.
38. Richardson P, Greenslade J, Shanmugathasan S, Doucet K, Widdicombe N, Chu K, et al. PREDICT: a diagnostic accuracy study of a tool for predicting mortality within one year: who should have an advance healthcare directive? *Palliat Med.* 2015 Jan;29(1):31–7.
39. Baylis J, Harris DR, Chen C, Ting DK, Clark K, Kwan A, et al. Palliative and end-of-life care education in Canadian emergency medicine residency programs: A national cross-sectional survey. *CJEM.* 2019 Mar;21(2):219–25.
40. Pauls MA, Singer PA, Dubinsky I. Communicating advance directives from long-term care facilities to emergency departments. *J Emerg Med.* 2001 Jul;21(1):83–9.
41. Ministère de la Santé et des Services sociaux. Niveaux de soins - Niveaux d'interventions médicales (NIM) : parlons-en dans le contexte de la pandémie de la COVID-19 - Publications du ministère de la Santé et des Services sociaux [Internet]. Québec, Québec; 2021 Feb [cited 2024 Jul 8] p. 20. Report No.: 20-210-395W. Available from: <https://publications.msss.gouv.qc.ca/msss/document-002933/?&date=DESC&titre=ASC& sujet=covid-19&critere=sujet>
42. Le ministre de la Santé et des Services sociaux. Act respecting end-of-life care [Internet]. CQLR c S-32.0001 CanLII; Jun 15, 2016 p. 30. Available from: <https://www.canlii.org/en/qc/laws/stat/rsq-c-s-32.0001/126673/rsq-c-s-32.0001.html#document>
43. May CR, Cummings A, Girling M, Bracher M, Mair FS, May CM, et al. Using Normalization Process Theory in feasibility studies and process evaluations of complex healthcare interventions: a systematic review. *Implement Sci.* 2018 Jun 7;13(1):80.

Table 2. Themes related to the four Normalization Process Theory constructs

NPT construct	Themes	Number of occurrences (n)	Verbatim citations (Translated to English)*
Coherence	Concept of interpersonal communication	10	“It’s an interaction with the patient aiming to identify the patient’s wishes. What does the patient wish for in terms of investigations and treatments according to their own perception of their quality of life and life expectancy.” (P5)
	Efficiency of care	10	“Well to know the patient’s expectations and to guide the treatments and my interventions according to those expectations, it may be odd to say, but it is almost more efficient afterwards” (P4)
	Anxiety generated by the discussion	9	“If we look at it from the ED physician perspective, there may be a risk of it being time consuming” (P2) “Objectively there is none, but subjectively, the patient may get the impression that we will propose less intense treatments, [or] not intense, but sometimes discussions of non-treatment of cardiac arrest or other severe conditions, sometimes the patient may feel that we do not wish to offer them everything.” (P3) “[...] for the family, I think there’s a risk of conflicts, anxiety or guilt.” (P7)
	Coming together of clinician, patient and family	10	“Ideally to do so in the presence of the patient’s close ones.” (P5)
	The importance of knowing the patients’ goals of care before end-of-shift medical handover	8	“Evening shift, night shift, I have a tendency to do it more; day shift, I do it less because I think somebody else is going to do it.” (P8)
Identification of an acute deterioration	10	“I try to do it straight away for all my patients who I think can do it, ... well all my patients, for unstable patients for sure, for semi-stable patients, for sure, but for stable patients over 70 years old as soon as they have comorbidities or they have a disease, I	

	leading to the GCD		mean cardiac, that could deteriorate rapidly.” (P7)
Cognitive participation	Lack of training on the new goals of care form	4	“No one trained me, or I didn’t have training.” (P7)
	Availability of protocols to promote the recommendation	4	“We have new forms on end-of-life symptoms management, respiratory distress management, now there are protocols, we received them around two weeks ago.” (P8)
Collective action	Heterogeneous prioritization for leading GCD	10	<p>“Well, I wouldn’t say encouraged, there is no precise priority for example in the ED to talk about it aside from our projects, but it could be a point to bring on the agenda from time to time. It’s not negative, between you and me, it’s like other things, when you implement.” (P6)</p> <p>P6: “He forgot; did you complete the goals of care? It’s often forgotten by people, but it’s not negative. They don’t say “aww I’m fed up”. It’s more: “I didn’t think about it”, but you ask yourself, “how much didn’t you try to remember.”</p> <p>I: “Yes, exactly, is it an excuse.”</p> <p>P6: “So then, it can be included in our points to improve.” (P6)</p>
			<p>“I’ll say it as it is, the other professionals that I think are not in sync are the oncology physicians; there are no discussed goals of care for patients with palliative cancer treatment, and then, it’s a big deal, they want me to intubate them. I have had discordant situations in oncology.” (P10)</p> <p>I: “OK, then relative to, you know, we talked a bit about it before, that we could transition patients directly to palliative care, directly admitted to the ward, admitted to palliative care. Is it relatively easy or are there still ministerial barriers or are there a lack of beds or you know?”</p> <p>P1: “There were a few beds missing, there are beds missing, but it depends, you know, it’s variable. Personally, I have an excellent service, I have found.”</p> <p>I: “OK”</p>

P1: "Since this is available, it's also recent, it's been a year that this exists."

I: "OK OK OK."

P1: "Yeah, before it was always a consultant who admitted the patient then it was a concurrent follow-up with palliative care."

I: "Aww OK OK, it makes sense now."

P1: "only in pure palliative care."

I: "Yeah."

P1: "It's really recent and still in development, there is more and more now, so the service is improving."

I: "Ok, what about palliative care physicians and their involvement in the ED, are they easily available for advice, immediate consultation, does that go well?"

P1: "Yes, generally yes."

I: "OK"

P1: "there are always exceptions"

I: "Yeah (laugh)"

P1: "As in any service, but generally they are accessible and really helpful." (P1)

"They are helpful, and they try their best to have an available bed... then no, I think that even for administrators it's, it's a winning situation" (P1)

"They are more uncomfortable to do active care in certain patients that, they mention this to us" (P9)

Reflexive monitoring	Need to take action before patients consult in the emergency department	8	"[...] it could be a social consensus to say: the patient is 75, 80, 85 years old, we'll set the norm we want, but it's part of routine discussions we should have at my annual visit." (P5)
----------------------	---	---	--

	Need to develop	8	"[...] if it was discussed more in society. If we found a way to discuss this, then people
--	-----------------	---	--

education programs		would become aware [...] about knowing what we expect to know from them and what we expect them to think about with their loved ones. (P4) “It would be a nice thing to have, a training on what the region has to offer, not just resuscitation and here are the possible paths.” (P6)
Need for legislation	4	“We have the health insurance card for organ donation, would it be an added thing to add a signature one day.” (P5) “The other thing you mention, the Long-Term Care patients. [...] I don’t know if there would be a way to create a law that every patient living in Long Term Care facilities, private seniors’ homes or others should have a previously determined level of care.” (P5)
Need to improve the ED environment and human resources	4	“Then, you know, otherwise in the ED, also sometimes it’s the physical spaces, to have a level of care discussion in a hallway, it’s always troublesome. We have a family room, but it’s at the other end of the ED.” (P8) “For the patient, there are benefits and I think that we have to take the time to support patients psychologically, help, nurses can help a lot because they are always close to them, and I think that this must be done as a team, you know, there should even be a psychologist sometimes...” (P7)
Selective systematization of GCD for patients	9	“It’s impossible, yesterday I had 56 patients, I was alone, forget about it, it’s impossible we have no time. You must choose the patients that would benefit the most from those discussions, for who is this going to make a difference short-term, because our ratio of elderly patients, their comprehension and our mental health balance you know.” (P3)

P(n): participant number; I: interviewer, * For the original verbatim transcripts in French, please contact the authors

Appendix 1: Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR)*

Title and abstract

Page

<p>Title - Concise description of the nature and topic of the study Identifying the study as qualitative or indicating the approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory) or data collection methods (e.g., interview, focus group) is recommended</p>	Title page
<p>Abstract - Summary of key elements of the study using the abstract format of the intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results, and conclusions</p>	2

Introduction

<p>Problem formulation - Description and significance of the problem/phenomenon studied; review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement</p>	Clinician's capsule on page 3, page 4
<p>Purpose or research question - Purpose of the study and specific objectives or questions</p>	4

Methods

<p>Qualitative approach and research paradigm - Qualitative approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology, narrative research) and guiding theory if appropriate; identifying the research paradigm (e.g., postpositivist, constructivist/ interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale**</p>	4
<p>Researcher characteristics and reflexivity - Researchers' characteristics that may influence the research, including personal attributes, qualifications/experience, relationship with participants, assumptions, and/or presuppositions; potential or actual interaction between researchers' characteristics and the research questions, approach, methods, results, and/or transferability</p>	5
<p>Context - Setting/site and salient contextual factors; rationale**</p>	4 and 5

<p>Sampling strategy - How and why research participants, documents, or events were selected; criteria for deciding when no further sampling was necessary (e.g., sampling saturation); rationale**</p>	<p>4 and 5</p>
<p>Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects - Documentation of approval by an appropriate ethics review board and participant consent, or explanation for lack thereof; other confidentiality and data security issues</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>Data collection methods - Types of data collected; details of data collection procedures including (as appropriate) start and stop dates of data collection and analysis, iterative process, triangulation of sources/methods, and modification of procedures in response to evolving study findings; rationale**</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Data collection instruments and technologies - Description of instruments (e.g., interview guides, questionnaires) and devices (e.g., audio recorders) used for data collection; if/how the instrument(s) changed over the course of the study</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Units of study - Number and relevant characteristics of participants, documents, or events included in the study; level of participation (could be reported in results)</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Data processing - Methods for processing data prior to and during analysis, including transcription, data entry, data management and security, verification of data integrity, data coding, and anonymization/de-identification of excerpts</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Data analysis - Process by which inferences, themes, etc., were identified and developed, including the researchers involved in data analysis; usually references a specific paradigm or approach; rationale**</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>Techniques to enhance trustworthiness - Techniques to enhance trustworthiness and credibility of data analysis (e.g., member checking, audit trail, triangulation); rationale**</p>	<p>5 and 6</p>

Results/findings

Synthesis and interpretation - Main findings (e.g., interpretations, inferences, and themes); might include development of a theory or model, or integration with prior research or theory	6 to 10
Links to empirical data - Evidence (e.g., quotes, field notes, text excerpts, photographs) to substantiate analytic findings	6 to 10 Table 2

Discussion

Integration with prior work, implications, transferability, and contribution(s) to the field - Short summary of main findings; explanation of how findings and conclusions connect to, support, elaborate on, or challenge conclusions of earlier scholarship; discussion of scope of application/generalizability; identification of unique contribution(s) to scholarship in a discipline or field	10 to 12
Limitations - Trustworthiness and limitations of findings	12

Other

Conflicts of interest - Potential sources of influence or perceived influence on study conduct and conclusions; how these were managed	13
Funding - Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data collection, interpretation, and reporting	13 and 14

*The authors created the SRQR by searching the literature to identify guidelines, reporting standards, and critical appraisal criteria for qualitative research; reviewing the reference lists of retrieved sources; and contacting experts to gain feedback. The SRQR aims to improve the transparency of all aspects of qualitative research by providing clear standards for reporting qualitative research.

**The rationale should briefly discuss the justification for choosing that theory, approach, method, or technique rather than other options available, the assumptions and limitations implicit in those choices, and how those choices influence study conclusions and transferability. As appropriate, the rationale for several items might be discussed together.

Appendix 2: Interview guide (English translation)*

In January 2016, INESSS made recommendations in its report of levels of care: quality norms and standards, or *Les niveaux de soins : cadre, processus et méthodes d'élaboration du guide sur les normes et standards de qualité*. In general, a discussion of levels of care should be initiated with anyone whose current prognosis suggests a lack of improvement or a lasting deterioration in their health, quality of life, or autonomy, in the short or medium term. This recommendation is particularly targeted for people who:

1. have a limited life expectancy
2. are at a high risk of deterioration due to an acute or chronic health condition or a state of frailty
3. at risk of major complications from surgery, endoscopy or other invasive procedures
4. are receiving palliative or end-of-life care
5. are struggling with proven cognitive impairment
6. are followed in oncology and who have a limited prognosis
7. have a high probability of being hospitalized or admitted at the emergency department within a year
8. are admitted at the emergency room, acute care or intensive care
9. have completed and registered an advance medical directive (AMD)
10. request a discussion of levels of care.

The following interview is intended to understand whether this recommendation is feasible.

Before starting the interview

1. Discuss the length of the interview (approximately 30 minutes) and content of the interview
2. Ask for permission to record
3. Informed consent was already obtained as part of a larger study

Interview questions organized by the NPT constructs (coherence, cognitive participation, collective action, and reflexive monitoring).

Coherence

1. What do you think a levels of care discussion is?
2. In your opinion, what are the risks and benefits of discussing levels of care with your patients? *Sub-questions: (patient, professional, systems, population).*

3. At what point during the ICU stay (or emergency department, or other place of care) do you determine *that it is necessary* to initiate a level of care discussion with a patient?

4. At what point during the ICU stay (or emergency department, or other place of care) do you determine *that it is not necessary* to initiate a level of care discussion with a patient?

5. In what medical situations do you think these discussions *should be* undertaken at the outset?

6. In what medical situations do you think these discussions *should be avoided* in the first place?

Cognition

7. What has been put in place to help you implement this recommendation?

Collective action

8. Do you feel that other health professionals support the application of this recommendation?

Sub-questions: (nurse, other doctors, manager)?



Reflexive monitoring

9. In your opinion, could the practice of level of care discussions be sustained or systematized under current conditions?

10. What policy or culture changes are needed to facilitate the implementation of the recommendation?

*For the Original French version of this interview guide, the « *Grille d'entrevue semi-dirigée basée sur la Théorie du processus de normalisation* », please contact the authors.

Appendix 3: Institut national d'excellence en santé et services sociaux de Québec form: Levels of care and cardiopulmonary resuscitation (English)*

  DT9262	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td colspan="2">Last name of user</td></tr> <tr><td colspan="2">First name</td></tr> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;">File number</td> <td style="width: 40%;">Date of birth Year Month Day</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sex <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F</td> <td>Health insurance number</td> </tr> </table>	Last name of user		First name		File number	Date of birth Year Month Day	Sex <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F	Health insurance number
Last name of user									
First name									
File number	Date of birth Year Month Day								
Sex <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> F	Health insurance number								
LEVELS OF CARE AND CARDIOPULMONARY RESUSCITATION <i>The goals of care below are indicative and are intended to orient medically appropriate care.</i>									
Institution name									
Revise using a new form following any change in health status or at the request of the user or his/her representative.									
Capacity to discuss levels of care									
<input type="checkbox"/> Competent <input type="checkbox"/> Incompetent: <input type="checkbox"/> Homologated mandate <input type="checkbox"/> Public/private curator; Name: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Minor under 14 years old Name of tutor, relationship with user: _____									
Previous advance wishes: <input type="checkbox"/> None available <input type="checkbox"/> Prior level of care form <input type="checkbox"/> Advance medical directive <input type="checkbox"/> Living will or other									
Levels of care: check and provide details in the box below <i>(Explanatory notes on the reverse side)</i>									
<input type="checkbox"/> Goal A: Prolong life with all necessary care <input type="checkbox"/> Goal B: Prolong life with some limitations to care <input type="checkbox"/> Goal C: Ensure comfort as a priority over prolonging life <input type="checkbox"/> Goal D: Ensure comfort without prolonging life	Give details on specific interventions in the box below, as needed. <i>e.g., hemodialysis, blood transfusion, nutritional support (enteral or parenteral), preventive care, etc.</i>								
Cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR): check and provide details in the box below <i>(Explanatory notes on the reverse side)</i>									
Cardiac (circulatory) arrest	Check if NOT desired, to guide prehospital care for goals B and C <i>(see reverse side)</i>								
<input type="checkbox"/> Attempt CPR <input type="checkbox"/> Do NOT attempt CPR	<input type="checkbox"/> NO emergency intubation (goals B and C only) <input type="checkbox"/> NO assisted ventilation if unconscious (goal C only)								
Explanatory notes on the discussion and instructions concerning specific interventions									
Discussed with: <input type="checkbox"/> User <input type="checkbox"/> Representative Name _____ Relationship _____									
Contact information _____									
Record the names of the participants as well as the words used during the discussion and all information that helps clarify the user's wishes.									
Name of physician	Signature	Date (year, month, day)							
Contact information _____									
If a copy of this form is given to the user or his/her representative, it is signed by him/her so that paramedic ambulance technicians can follow the instructions on the form.									
Name of user or representative	Signature	Date (year, month, day)							

Explanatory notes

- This form is not a substitute for consent to treatment, which must always be obtained (*except in certain emergency situations*).
- This form must be signed by a physician.

Description of levels of care

The discussion about levels of care is carried out with the user or, in the case of incapacity, with his/her representative, in the spirit of shared decision-making about medically appropriate care. The explanations and examples provided in the following descriptions do not assume capacity on the part of the user, nor do they necessarily reflect his/her usual care setting.

Goal A Prolong life with all necessary care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Care includes all interventions that are medically appropriate and transfer¹ if the intervention is not available in the current setting. • All invasive interventions can be considered, including, for example, intubation and intensive care. <p>► In the prehospital setting, unless otherwise advised by the user or his/her representative, all protocols apply; intubation, assisted ventilation² and assisted respiration³ are included when appropriate.</p>
Goal B Prolong life with some limitations to care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Care incorporates interventions with the aim of prolonging life, which offer the possibility of correcting deterioration in health status while preserving quality of life. • Interventions may lead to discomfort that is judged to be acceptable by the user or his/her representative acting in the sole interests of the user, given the circumstances and the expected outcomes. • Certain interventions are excluded since they are judged to be disproportionate⁴ or unacceptable⁴ by the user or his/her representative acting in the sole interests of the user, given the potential for recovery and undesired consequences (e.g., <i>short-term or long-term intubation, major surgery, transfer</i>). <p>► In the prehospital setting, unless otherwise advised by the user or his/her representative, all protocols apply; assisted ventilation² and assisted respiration³ are included; intubation is included unless indicated as not desired on the form (checked in the prehospital care box).</p>
Goal C Ensure comfort as a priority over prolonging life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The user's comfort is prioritized through the management of symptoms. • Interventions which may prolong life are used as needed in order to correct certain reversible health problems, by means judged acceptable by the user or his/her representative acting in the sole interests of the user (e.g., <i>oral or intravenous antibiotics to treat pneumonia</i>). • Transfer to an appropriate care setting is considered only if care available locally is insufficient to ensure comfort (e.g., <i>for a hip fracture with significant discomfort or for respiratory distress at home</i>). <p>► In the prehospital setting, unless otherwise advised by the user or his/her representative, all protocols apply; assisted respiration³ is included; intubation and assisted ventilation² are included unless indicated as not desired on the form (checked in the prehospital care box).</p>
Goal D Ensure comfort without prolonging life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Care is exclusively aimed at maintaining comfort through the management of symptoms (e.g., <i>pain, trouble breathing, constipation, anxiety</i>). • Interventions do not aim to prolong life; illness is left to its natural course. • A treatment that is usually given with curative intent may be used, but only because it represents the best option to relieve discomfort (e.g., <i>oral antibiotics for a lower urinary tract or C. difficile infection</i>). • Transfer to an appropriate care setting is considered only if care available locally is insufficient to ensure comfort (e.g., <i>for a hip fracture with significant discomfort or for respiratory distress at home</i>). <p>► In the prehospital setting, unless otherwise advised by the user or his/her representative, the following protocols apply: oxygenation, salbutamol, nitroglycerin (chest pain) and glucagon. For respiratory distress in a conscious user, assisted respiration³ (CPAP) can be used unless refused. Intubation and assisted ventilation² are excluded. Manoeuvres to clear an obstructed airway in a living user can be carried out.</p>

Cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR)

CPR is part of the same discussion as levels of care. The decision is specified in a distinct manner to allow rapid decisions in the case of cardiorespiratory arrest. A CPR decision is only applicable in the case of a cardiac arrest with arrest in circulation. In the case that a CPR attempt is desired, measures available on site will be deployed while awaiting the arrival of emergency medical services, according to the situation.

¹ The term "transfer" implies moving the user to a setting that is different from his/her current environment (leaving his/her home, inter-institutional or intra-institutional transfer, etc.). If a transfer is not being considered, a care goal other than A must be selected.

² Assisted ventilation is carried out via non-invasive techniques (bag-valve-mask, Oxylator) in an unconscious user.

³ Assisted respiration is carried out via non-invasive techniques (CPAP) in a conscious user.

⁴ The sense of the terms "disproportionate" or "unacceptable" is based on subjective perceptions and values that vary from person to person and across time. The words used by the user or his/her representative are important to record in the box provided for this purpose.

*For the French version of this form, readers are invited to contact the authors, or to consult the form on the [INESSS site](#).