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ABSTRACT

Background: From a baseline of near zero, there has in recent years been a growing number of empirical studies related to mental health nurses’ delivery of healthcare for severely physically deteriorating patients or in medical emergency situations. To date, this evidence-base has not been systematically identified, appraised, and integrated.

Objectives: To systematically identify, appraise and synthesise the available empirical evidence about mental health nurses, medical emergencies, and the severely physiologically deteriorating patient.

Design: A systematic review in accordance with relevant points of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses guidelines.

Data sources: Multiple electronic databases (CINAHL; PubMed; MedLine; Scopus, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses) were searched using comprehensive terms.
Review methods: Inclusion criteria: English language papers describing empirical studies (any design) about i) the effectiveness of interventions to improve any outcome related to mental health nurses' delivery of emergency medical care or care for the severely deteriorating patient; or ii) mental health nurses’ emergency medical care-related knowledge, skills, experience, attitudes, or training needs. Further information was sought from study authors. Included studies were independently assessed for quality. Effect sizes from intervention studies were extracted or calculated where there was sufficient information. An integrative synthesis of study findings was conducted.

Results: A total of 22 studies, all but one published since 2011, met inclusion criteria. Ten were intervention studies and twelve were cross-sectional observational or qualitative studies. Intervention studies were all of weak quality overall and utilised pre- post designs mostly with limited post intervention follow-up time. Observational and qualitative studies were generally of good quality but only parts of the evidence from these studies were relevant to emergency physical care since most focused on mental health nurses and their routine physical healthcare practice.

Conclusions: There are currently no validated instruments to investigate mental health nurses’ emergency medical care-related attitudes. More rigorous controlled trials of interventions are needed to better establish an evidence-base for educational interventions to improve this groups’ emergency care-related practice.

Abbreviations used:

CJR – Clinical Judgement Rubric; ED – Emergency Department; GSES – Generalised Self Efficacy Scale; MEWS – Modified Early Warning Score; RRR – Rapid Response Report

Keywords: Mental health nurses, emergency medicine, deteriorating patient, educational interventions, attitudes, knowledge

BACKGROUND

People with diagnoses of mental disorder are at more than double the risk of all-cause mortality than others in the population; most at risk are those with
psychoses, mood disorder and anxiety; mortality rates are significantly higher in studies which include inpatients (John et al., 2018). Median years of life lost by this group is 10.1 years compared with population controls (Walker et al., 2015). While risk of unnatural causes of death are greatly increased, it is death from natural causes that remains responsible for the vast majority of mortality among people with mental disorder. In people with schizophrenia, for example, cardiovascular disease accounts for about one third of all deaths, cancer for one in six; other common causes of death are diabetes mellitus, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, influenza, and pneumonia (Olfson et al., 2015). Implicated in increased mortality are high rates of smoking (Drope et al., 2018), obesity (Annamalai et al., 2017), exposure to high levels of antipsychotic pharmacotherapy (Tomiainen et al., 2016) and mental disorder itself (Walker et al., 2015). While accounting for a small number of deaths overall, patients with serious mental disorder are vulnerable to restraint-related death due, in part, to pre-existing conditions that increase the risk of cardiac arrest and the fact that restraint can lead to positional asphyxia (Aiken et al., 2011).

Failure to recognise and appropriately respond to significant physiological deterioration in patients admitted to mental health units has been highlighted as a factor in a number of fatal adverse events in these settings (Findlay et al., 2012). While the reasons for this are multifactorial, it is likely related to the relative infrequency of acute physiological deterioration in mental health settings and hence, staff lacking experience in recognising and responding effectively, or
underestimating the seriousness of a situation (Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care, n.d.). Further, in a scoping review on recognising and responding to deterioration in mental state, Craze et al. (2014: p.21) have suggested that the language used in medical records and verbal handovers in mental health settings reflects the superficial nature of engagement with observation for signs of clinical deterioration of patients. Examples include: ‘patient appears settled’, ‘patient appears to be resting’ and ‘no change observed’. Further evidence suggests management of physiological deterioration in mental health settings is often suboptimal due to poor communication between multiple healthcare providers from more than one team, and across different locations (Craze et al., 2014).

Documentation of physical health assessments in mental health settings has also been shown to be poor with one study finding more than half the case notes audited were missing details of appropriate assessments; even basic observations such as recording a blood pressure on admission were only recorded in 57% of case notes (Ward, 2005). Even with adequate documentation, failure to identify deteriorating patients can occur because there is a lack of knowledge of signs and symptoms indicating physiological deterioration, or failure to recognise the significance of these findings (Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care, 2008). Even in spite of the advent of ‘track and trigger’ systems that assist with early recognition of clinical deterioration, such as the medical emergency team criteria in Australia and the modified early warning score (MEWS) in the UK, research has identified that the sensitivity of these tools is low and their utility,
validity and reliability have not been adequately established (Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care, 2010). Regardless, patient safety organisations and experts advocate their use for early identification and improved recording of observations (National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, 2007; Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care, 2010).

Also implicated as contributing factors to the failure to recognise physiological deterioration in patients with mental illness are the resistant or negative attitudes of clinicians who regard their role as exclusively attending to patient’s mental well-being: a number of studies have reported that mental health nurses lack confidence in conducting physical health assessment, neurological observations and emergency medical care including cardiopulmonary resuscitation (Ward, 2005). In one Australian study mental health nurses utilised significantly fewer, typically half or less, core physical assessment skills compared with surgical and medical nurses (Osborn et al., 2015). While the number of core skills would be expected to differ based on the clinical work area, of note, measuring breathing rate, pattern and related chest expansion were not skills regularly used by mental health nurses and, given changes in respiratory rate are one of the earliest signs of physiological deterioration (Mok et al., 2015), could account for a proportion of adverse events in mental health settings.

There has been a tangible and growing international response among mental health nursing academics and practitioners to this situation epitomised by a number of literature reviews covering a range of delineated areas including a decade of UK-
only research on the role of mental health nurses in physical health care (Blythe & White, 2012); consumers’ and professionals’ perceptions of barriers to physical health care for people with serious mental illness (Happell et al., 2012); the focus and content of nurse-provided physical health care for mental health service users (Happell et al., 2014); and the physical health of people with severe mental illness (Collins et al., 2012). A relatively recently developed tool, the Physical Healthcare Attitude Scale for mental health nurses (Robson & Haddad, 2012), has demonstrated a range of attitudes towards and involvement in physical healthcare internationally among mental health nurses (Robson et al., 2013; Haddad et al., 2016; Ganiah et al., 2017; Bressington et al., 2018). However, for the most part the scale does not address nurses’ attitudes to or involvement in emergency medical care or care of the severely physiologically deteriorating patient. Further, to our knowledge no one has thus far systematically identified and reviewed the growing literature about mental health nurses and the provision of emergency medical care or care for the patient with clear signs of severe physiological deterioration. In the context of this review, emergency medical care is defined as life-saving measures instituted in life-threatening situations, such as a cardiac arrest (Hirshon et al., 2013); while care of the severely physiologically deteriorating patient is defined as the ability to recognise and respond to observable severe physiological abnormalities prior to an adverse event (Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Healthcare, 2017).
In this context we have conducted a systematic review to identify, appraise, and synthesise existing evidence from empirical research literature about i) mental health nurses’ experience of providing emergency medical health care and care for the severely physically deteriorating patient and their related knowledge, skills, educational preparation, and attitudes; ii) the effectiveness of any interventions aimed at improving or changing mental health nurses’ practice related to emergency medical care or care of the physically deteriorating patient; and iii) to identify implications for the future provision of relevant training and education, for policy, research, and practice. The specific review question being addressed therefore is: what is known from the international, English language, empirical literature about mental health nurses’ skills, knowledge, attitudes, and experiences regarding provision of emergency medical care and care for the severely physiologically deteriorating patient.

METHODS

Design

Systematic review of the literature following the relevant points of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (Moher et al., 2009).

Search strategy

The review included both effectiveness and experiential questions. We therefore devised a two-pronged literature search strategy. To capture studies about related experience we used a Population Exposure Output format review question in
which the population was defined as mental health nurses, the exposure as emergency medical and/or physiological deterioration situations or simulations, and the outcomes using experiential, social, educational, cognitive, or attitudinal terms (see Table 1). To ensure we captured studies relevant to the question of intervention effectiveness we used a Population Intervention Comparator Outcome structure (Population: mental health nurses; Intervention: any including education, policy or guideline change; Comparator: any or none; Outcome: any) (Munn et al., 2018). We searched five electronic databases: i) CINAHL, ii) PubMed, iii) MedLine, iv) Scopus, and v) ProQuest Dissertations and Theses using text words and MeSH terms. We also searched the reference list of all included studies, plus those of relevant review studies. Searching was informed by the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care (2011) standard on recognising and responding to clinical deterioration in acute health care. The literature strategy was designed by GLD and conducted independently by GLD and EMB.

**Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

Studies were included if they were an English language account of an empirical study (any design) which examined exposure to real or simulated medical emergencies. Studies were included if the participants were or included mental health nurses defined as such by the study authors or were described in the study as registered nurses working in a psychiatric or mental health setting. No date or setting limiters were applied.

**Data extraction**
The following information was extracted from included studies: title, author, publication year, data collection years, study location (country), research objectives, aims or hypotheses, design, population, sample details and size, data sources, study variables (i.e., details of intervention) or other exposure, unit of analysis, and study findings. Further, we categorised studies as interventional or non-interventional. Intervention studies aimed to describe the impact of an educational or real world (e.g., policy or practice) change in terms of any mental health nurse- or nursing-related outcome including patient-related variables arising from nursing actions (e.g., Medical Emergency Team referral). Non-intervention studies were either descriptive of mental health nurse- or nursing-related outcomes and/or utilised case control designs to compare them with those of other occupational or professional groups. We contacted corresponding authors of included studies regarding any issues where clarification or additional data could aid the review. Where effect sizes were presented we extracted this information or where sufficient information was presented in the paper, or following correspondence with the corresponding author, we calculated the appropriate effect size statistic for the test used.

**Study quality appraisal**

Studies used a range of quantitative and qualitative methods and no single appraisal tool was suitable for all studies. We assessed the likelihood of bias in intervention studies with reference to criteria described by Thomas et al. (2004) and involving assessment of the likelihood of selection bias in the obtained sample, study design, potential confounders, blinding, potential for bias in data collection.
from invalid instrumentation, and participant retention (see Table 2). Relevant items from the US Department of Health & Human Sciences NIH Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies (NIH National Heart, Lung & Blood Institute, 2018) were used to assess cross-sectional observational studies (see Table 3). Qualitative descriptive studies were assessed using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (n.d.) tool (see Table 4). Quality appraisal was conducted independently by authors GLD, LR, and GE. Where agreement was unanimous this was recorded; otherwise items were discussed until consensus was reached.

**Study synthesis**

Meta analysis was not possible due to the heterogeneous nature of study designs and outcomes. We tabulated information about study findings and conducted an iterative process of grouping and theming results resulting in a descriptive synthesis. We carefully considered study quality in the emphasis placed on individual study findings in the results section and it underpinned our discussion and recommendations.

**RESULTS**

**Study settings and participants**

The search strategy resulted in the inclusion of 21 studies published in 22 papers (see Fig 1 flowchart inclusion flowchart; Tables 5a and 5b) involving a total of 2,076 (M[SD]=125.7[172.9], Mdn=57, range 7 to 585) mental health nurses or mental health nursing students (n= 124; 5.6%). In addition, one study (Puskar et al.,
2011) provided no details of participant numbers or characteristics, and a second
(Flood et al., 2014) reported $N=393$ participants in total but no details of profession.
We retained the study since a considerable proportion of the 280 ‘frontline’ staff
involved would be mental health nurses. Manu et al. (2015) examined Rapid
Response Team calls made over a 10-month period in a US psychiatric hospital and
reported the proportion made by various disciplinary groups including nurses.

Studies were conducted in the UK ($k=8$), US ($k=6$), Australia, Ethiopia, Finland,
India, Jordan, (all $k=1$); one international study was conducted across three nations,
namely Qatar, China (Hong Kong), and Japan. Two papers (Robson & Haddad,
2012; Robson et al., 2013) described different analyses from the same dataset and
were treated as one study for the purpose of this review.

Study designs

Of the included studies, ten examined an intervention ($k=7$ an educational
intervention, $k=1$ a policy intervention, and $k=2$ a mixed educational/policy and
practice intervention). Of the seven education-only intervention studies, $k=6$
evaluated a simulation and $k=1$ a paper-based self-instruction module. Of the
intervention studies, $k=7$ utilised longitudinal pre- post- intervention (AB) designs,
$k=2$ (Hermanns et al., 2011; Unsworth et al., 2012) were cross-sectional and
evaluated quantitative outcomes only following the change or intervention;
Unsworth et al.’s (2012) study used qualitative methods only and was also cross-
sectional. All eleven non- intervention studies utilised cross-sectional designs. Of
these, \( k=4 \) were unmatched case control studies and \( k=2 \) used qualitative methods only.

**Intervention/ exposure**

The simulation(s) employed in intervention studies were generally described in some detail. Simulation training length was 30-minutes (Hermanns et al., 2011), half a day (Lavelle et al., 2017), and one day (Herisko et al., 2015; Chadwick & Withnell, 2016). Information on simulation intervention length was not provided by Wynn et al (2011) or Unsworth et al. (2012). Details of simulations can be seen in Table 5a; in brief, they involved manikins or human person simulators of varying sophistication ranging from a manikin of realistic weight to more sophisticated Human Person Simulators capable of producing physiological outputs or with the ability to ‘speak’ by researcher remote access. The simulation scenarios involved attempted suicide by hanging (Hermanns et al., 2011), care provision for diabetic medical conditions (Wynn, 2011); alcohol intoxication, drug induced psychosis, and chest infection in a patient with Alzheimer’s Disease (Unsworth et al., 2012); medical deterioration and prevention of medical emergencies (Fernando et al., 2018); respiratory arrest, diabetic hypoglycaemia, hanging and choking (Lavelle et al., 2017).

Non-simulation intervention studies aimed to evaluate the effect of the introduction of standardized guidelines and associated mandatory training for nurses about Medical Emergency Team access (Puskar et al., 2011), a self-instructional module (Paulose et al., 2016), introduction of a modified early warning score sheet
and associated training (Shaddel et al., 2014), and the introduction of personal health plans for patients in a low secure forensic unit together with a single educational session on physical health care for nursing staff (Haddad et al., 2016).

Among the non-intervention studies, Herisko and colleagues (Herisko et al., 2013) employed a qualitative design involving a group interview to gather information about exposure to utilizing Medical Emergency Teams in a US psychiatric hospital. A second study by the team (Herisko et al., 2015) used an amended form of the structured interview used in the previous study to gather quantitative data. In an unpublished PhD thesis, Shanley (2012) conducted qualitative interviews with mental health nurses with experience of exposure to suicide or other sudden unexpected death of a patient. Of 15 participants, \( n=6 \) had direct experience of a fatal event including attempted resuscitation and these accounts attracted additional analyses by the researcher. In Finland, Tenkanen et al. (2011) asked Registered Nurses (licensed professionals with a 4-y university education) and Practical Mental Nurses (individuals with a 3-y vocational qualification) working in forensic psychiatric settings about their own and their counterpart group’s mastery of ‘Life support skills and safety in potential violent situations’. Both groups were also rated by senior and managerial nursing staff. Flood et al. (2014) conducted a national cross-sectional survey to gather information about respondents’ knowledge and awareness of recommendations made in a Rapid Response Report about resuscitation training and also attempted to gauge the likelihood of the recommendations being met by asking respondents about their
own relevant training. Several studies have surveyed mental health nurses working in practice about their attitudes to physical health care including varying elements about medical emergency and physiological deterioration (Robson & Haddad, 2012; Robson et al., 2013; Haddad et al., 2016; Wynaden et al., 2016; Ganiah et al., 2017; Bressington et al., 2018).

**Outcomes measurement**

The most frequently used outcomes measure was the Physical Health Attitudes Scale for Mental Health Nurses (Robson & Haddad, 2012) in $k=4$ studies. While the tool has demonstrated validity and reliability the outcomes of interest for this review were limited to three items describing emergency/physiological deterioration related scenarios: namely, confidence in dealing with cardiac arrest, hypoglycaemia and hyperglycaemia. The remaining Physical Health Attitudes Scale for Mental Health Nurses items relate to smoking intervention, confidence in delivering routine physical health screening and advice. No other two or more studies used the same outcomes measure. Physical Health Attitudes Scale for Mental Health Nurses was used in five non-intervention studies RRobson & Haddad, 2012; Robson et al., 2013; Haddad et al., 2016; Ganiah et al., 2017; Bressington et al., 2018; the remaining seven involved purpose-designed interview or focus group schedules in qualitative studies (Shanley, 2012; Herisko et al., 2013), while the remaining studies used purpose-designed quantitative questionnaires Tenkanen et al., 2011; Flood et al., 2014; Herisko et al, 2015; Manu et al., 2015; Gebreegziabher et al., 2017). Physical Health Attitudes Scale for Mental Health
Nurses was used in one non-simulation intervention study (Haddad et al., 2016); other non-simulation intervention studies outcomes included proxy measures of nurse behaviour including number of emergency protocols activated (Puskar et al., 2011), semi-structured knowledge questionnaire regarding management of heart attack, respiratory arrest, convulsion, and hypoglycaemia (Paulose et al., 2016), and a 1-item clinical judgement self rating scale and two clinical vignette with dichotomous correct/incorrect answers (Shaddel et al., 2014).

The remaining simulation intervention studies used a researcher-completed observation rubric (Lasater, 2007), routinely collected medical transfer data, and a participant satisfaction with training questionnaire (Wynn, 2011), and purpose-designed tools aimed at capturing participants’ self-reported knowledge, confidence, and attitudes to emergency scenarios (Herisko et al., 2013; Lavelle et al., 2017). Lavelle et al. (2017) also collected qualitative data from a structured survey questionnaire and from focus groups, while Fernando et al. (2018) included a course evaluation form and open questions. Hermanns et al. (2011) collected data using a Self-Report Suicide Clinical Simulation Evaluation Tool, a nine-item tool requiring participants to self-assess against content and process objectives on a 5-point Likert scale. The outcome in this study relevant to the current review was level of agreement that the simulation had improved their understanding of relevant metabolic and physiological changes during a simulation of finding a patient hanging from a door in an apparent suicide attempt. Unsworth et al.’s (2012) cross-sectional study utilised qualitative methods only to elicit accounts from participants.
of the value of the simulation interventions investigated. Each simulation study also described how, to varying extents, they encouraged participants to ‘think aloud’ during exercised or video-recorded sessions. These data were usually then incorporated into the analysis.

**Study quality**

All ten intervention studies were rated as being of weak quality overall (See Table 2). None included any sort of control condition and there was no concealment to intervention or evaluation. Of the longitudinal studies, withdrawals were mostly non-existent though probably largely because measures were taken before and immediately after the training and longer term outcomes were only captured qualitatively. Haddad et al. (2016) conducted follow-up data collection at 4-months retaining just over 80% of the original sample.

Quality of the cross-sectional studies was generally higher than intervention studies ($Mdn$ score = 6, range 5-7, maximum possible 7) and it should be noted that quality of interventional studies might have been more favourably rated had they merely aimed to describe related phenomena rather than evaluate an intervention. The quality of the two qualitative studies varied widely: Shanley’s (2012) PhD thesis provided a rich detailed account of nurses’ experience of encountering suicide-type emergencies and is recommended.

**Study findings**

*Simulation intervention studies*
In the study by Wynn (2011) participants underwent scenarios involving simulations of providing diabetes care and, during which, circumstances might change according to evolving conditions (e.g., wrong clinical decisions might lead to escalating crisis such as cardiac arrest). There was a favourable statistically significant change from the pre- to the post intervention measurement of clinical judgment and 80% of participants were satisfied with the training. Additionally, the researcher reported a 55% fall in medical emergencies involving patients with diabetes in the month following the training. Fernando et al. (2018) reported statistically significant (large effect size $\eta^2$) improvements in knowledge following intervention, while Lavelle et al. (2017) reported a similarly large effect size for knowledge and moderate effect sizes (Cohen’s $d$) for positive changes in confidence and attitudes following simulated learning. Satisfaction with the training in Fernando’s study (2018) was rated on four questions. Mean positive affirmation of the questions was 99% (range 98-100%). rated positively by 99% of attendees. Qualitative data reported in these studies comprised exclusively positive comments about inter-professional learning, leadership and teamwork, reflection, communication, confidence, and personal responsibility. Chadwick and Withnell (2016) reported that self-efficacy self-ratings in relation to relevant statements about dealing with emergency or physiological deterioration situations improved. While they presented no inferential statistics, secondary analysis shows that change on all ten items was statistically significant in that participants were more likely to rate themselves moderately or highly confident in each area following the simulation compared to the baseline assessment where they more commonly rated themselves
as having no or only slight confidence (effect sizes [Cramer’s $v$] ranging from small [.21] to large [.52]).

Hermanns et al. (2011) cross-sectional study found that participants reported a mean score of 1.4 on ‘understanding of metabolic and physiological changes’ where 1=‘strongly agree’ and 5 ‘strongly disagree’. Unsworth et al. (2012) qualitative-only study found participants reporting that their simulation training had helped them to ‘bridge the gap’ in terms of providing an opportunity to practice skills that may occur only rarely in the clinical setting. They said that the training had raised their awareness of the possibility of patient physiological deterioration and had helped them recognise gaps in their own knowledge. They appreciated having learnt alongside adult nursing students especially as this had given them an additional perspective and they had found the simulation authentic. Finally, they had expressed surprise and shock that events such as intoxication and substance misuse could escalate to emergency levels and reported that, in future, they would be less likely to advise service users to ‘sleep it off’ given the importance of maintaining physiological observations.

**Non-simulation intervention studies**

Haddad et al. (2016) found a statistically significant difference on the Physical Health Attitudes Scale for Mental Health Nurses’ total score at 4-month follow-up, but not on any of the four subscales. Changes on one of three items specific to emergency or physiological deterioration situations was statistically
significant (hyperglycaemia) and for two non-significant (cardiac arrest, hypoglycaemia) (Mark Haddad, Personal correspondence 24th April 2018).

Paulose et al. (2016) reported that mean scores on individual knowledge tests about managing heart attack, respiratory arrest, convulsion, and hypoglycaemia all improved significantly following provision of a self-instruction intervention; in addition the frequency of those rated as having ‘very good’ knowledge in each area increased from 3% to 90%, 7% to 87%, 0% to 80%, and 0% to 83% respectively. Accordingly, effect size for each was uncommonly large with post-intervention Hedge’s g scores indicating shifts of 3.07 – 4.27 z-scores (i.e. SDs) from the pre-intervention level. A combined total knowledge score also increased significantly (Mean [SD] 22.06 [1.92] vs. 30.04 [2.82]; Hedges’g =3.31) (Bhattacharya Chanu, personal correspondence 2nd May 2018).

Puskar et al. (2011) study examined the number of Condition A (Arrest) and Condition C (Crisis) referrals made to a Medical Emergency Team following introduction of protocols and associated training. They reported a rise in Condition C reporting, presumably reflecting increased confidence in nurses to report early, and a decline in Condition A reports. Concurrently, there were falls in the number of fatal outcomes following the protocol introduction.

Shaddel et al. (2014) examined the effect on confidence and knowledge of mental health and learning disability nurses of a brief teaching session and introduction of a Modified Early Warning Score (MEWS) for physiologically deteriorating patients. Significantly more nurses identified the correct course of
action in two scenarios following the intervention ($\phi = .71$) and nurses also reported more confidence in their clinical judgement following introduction of the MEWS ($r = .87$).

**Non-interventional descriptive studies**

Four non-intervention studies (Robson & Haddad, 2012; Wynaden et al., 2016; Ganiah; 2017; Bressington et al., 2018) used the Physical Health Attitudes Scale for Mental Health Nurses to assess the attitudes of mental health nurses regarding physical health care. In addition, we present baseline data from Haddad et al.’s (2016) intervention study as it also used the Physical Health Attitudes Scale for Mental Health Nurses; thus Physical Health Attitudes Scale for Mental Health Nurses data is available for $N=1,523$ individuals. Across studies the proportion of respondents agreeing that they were confident they could resuscitate a client who had had a cardiac arrest was 67.3% (Ganiah et al., 2017), 73.0% (Robson et al., 2013), 82.3% (Wynaden et al., 2016), 86.0%, 87.0%, and 45.0% in Qatar, Hong Kong, and Japan respectively (Bressington et al., 2018) and 84.2% (Haddad et al., 2016).

Flood et al. (2014) found mixed levels of awareness among respondents to their national survey about recommendations about resuscitation practice in mental health settings in the Rapid Response Report. Only 36% of ‘frontline’ staff reported being aware of the recommendations. However, 82% of these had received some level of resuscitation training in the past year. Only 27%, compared with 26% of community staff and 48% of senior/managerial staff reported any actual experience
of resuscitation. There was a reported compliance rate of 67% with the report recommendation that units where rapid tranquilisation or seclusion might be used should have access to staff trained in immediate life support and relevant equipment. Respondents’ qualitative feedback suggested a lack of knowledge around emergency drug administration and lack of confidence in working with elderly people.

Tenkanen et al. (2011) study of nursing staff working in forensic mental health settings in Finland explored differences between groups of Registered and Practical Mental Health Nurses’ own and reciprocal group ratings of overall mastery of various domains including life support skills. Both groups were also rated by senior nurses/ managers. Results suggested that Practical Mental Health Nurses overestimated their own group’s mastery of life skills relative to Registered Nurses and managers’ ratings while Registered Nurses’ also overestimated their own mastery relative to other raters but to a lesser magnitude. The authors conclude that, based on broader information than this one topic area, Registered Nurses are better equipped in the skills required to provide effective care in the forensic environment.

Gebreeziabher Gebremedhn et al. (2017) compared self-report attitude and skill ratings of different professional undergraduate groups in relation to performing cardiopulmonary resuscitation. Only a small proportion (3.0%) of $N=506$ participants were mental health nursing students. They did not differ significantly
from any other group in terms of attitudes and rated themselves only as less skilled than anaesthetists.

Shanley (2012) found that physical presence during an inpatient sudden death or suicide added considerable qualitative complexity to their experience and reaction than for nurses who were informed of the suicide or other sudden death (i.e., community mental health nurses). Specifically, the former professed more concern about the outcome of coroner’s inquest reports.

Herisko et al.’s (2013, 2015) studies of mental health nurse’s experience of exposure to a Medical Emergency Team both found that nurses’ reported both positive and negative forces impacting on decisions to refer to Medical Emergency Team. However, in the larger survey study (Herisko et al., 2015) more respondents agreed with ‘negative forces’ statements ($M [SD] = 70.7[16.6]$) than with ‘positive forces’ statements ($M[SD]=51.1[21.2]$). Qualitative data suggests difficulties include the increased workload from calling the Medical Emergency Team, lack of experience, lack of participation in the Medical Emergency Team, unfamiliarity with patients, uncertainty whether symptoms meet Medical Emergency Team criteria, interruptions, and preferring to call the House Officer first. There was agreement from most participants with statements suggesting that physical healthcare for psychiatric patients is complex ($M[SD]=76.3[13.8]$). Finally, Manu et al (2015) reported that the majority of 169 Rapid Response Team activations were made by staff nurses (72.8%). The authors concluded that the introduction of a
Rapid Response Team empowered nurses to refer when the more traditional practice was for the patient’s psychiatrist to call a medical consultant.

**DISCUSSION**

We conducted a systematic review of the empirical literature about mental health nurses and emergency medical and clinical physiological deterioration situations. We took a broad approach to searching the literature due to a paucity of research on actual observations of care and included studies involving real or simulated situations and included studies involving mental health nursing students and multidisciplinary professional groups in addition to those including only mental health nurses. Nevertheless, only 21 studies met our review inclusion criteria. Further, some of these papers were only partially relevant since their main focus was on routine physical healthcare (Robson & Haddad, 2012; Robson et al., 2013; Wynaden et al., 2016; Ganiah; 2017; Bressington et al., 2018). Nevertheless, we included relevant results from these studies because they do represent some of the more contemporary sources of information. Nevertheless, we can state with confidence that there is a paucity of research in this important area of mental health nursing practice. Irrespective of the quantity of available research, the risk of bias of included studies, in particular the intervention studies, was generally significant.

*Effectiveness*

Of the evaluation studies, none employed a control group and none can truly support the conclusion that the intervention, usually a simulation, was responsible for any subsequent improvement in practice. Nevertheless, as far as what are largely
routine evaluations conducted as part of routine practice, they do suggest that the sessions are relevant, worthwhile, challenging, enjoyed by participants, and feasible to implement. While there may be substantial costs to simulated learning or training, the review tends to support its use in mental health for more than ‘non-technical’ and interprofessional communication skill development. Immersive experiences that authentically replicate ‘real life’ physiological deterioration, may be helpful in developing mental health nurses’ awareness, self-efficacy, confidence and critical thinking skills in medical emergencies whilst mitigating any risk or safety issues. The key educational benefits of simulation include opportunities to practice in a safe environment and receive feedback and debriefing, being exposed to a variety of scenarios, in a controlled environment and assessment of learning (Lateef, 2010). Further the review supports the need for greater awareness and training among mental health nurses of the policies and protocols within workplaces, which can increase confidence levels in reporting early or escalating using ‘track and trigger’ systems. Regardless, there is clearly a need for more rigorous evaluations conducted using valid and reliable instrumentation and using clear, reproducible protocols. Clearly we also need to look to the evidence on the effectiveness of various types of training, including simulation, for emergency situations in general and not just those involving mental health nursing. Of interest, meta-analysis has suggested that high fidelity manikins are moderately better than low fidelity manikins in improving skills when follow-up occurs immediately post training. However, when follow-up occurs at one year then there is no accrual of benefit (Cheng et al., 2015).
*Experiences*

There were clearly ‘mixed’ experiences among the mental health nurses in terms of their knowledge levels, skills, attitudes, education and training needs. Uncertainty and apprehension often due to poor knowledge and lack of awareness can contribute to a ‘blinkered’ approach to physiological deterioration in mental health and can further contribute to what is often referred to as diagnostic overshadowing; where “physical and/or behavioural symptoms are inappropriately accredited to mental illness” (Geiss et al., 2018: p.327). Further the review also highlighted that factors such as the availability of rapid response teams seemed to have a positive effect in empowering mental health nurses with the autonomy to independently ‘make the call’ to escalate a situation if concerned; potentially heightening clinical judgement skills and perhaps should be used more widely in mental health practice (Manu et al., 2015).

Next, what is the evidence about mental health nurses’ emergency-related outcomes relative to those of other professional groups? Again, we are somewhat hampered by the quality of evidence since the only case control studies were unmatched and we could not safely infer that differences were due to occupational as opposed to other variables. In terms of investigating attitudes, Physical Health Attitudes Scale for Mental Health Nurses is a welcome addition to the mental health nursing educational and development toolkit. It is likely that attitudes about physical healthcare will impact on nursing practice, although this should be tested. Given Physical Health Attitudes Scale for Mental Health Nurses’ psychometric properties
it should be used more widely and could be used as an outcomes measure in a well-designed case control study. Others (Herisko et al., 2015; Lavelle et al., 2017) have recognised the need to target outcomes related to education specifically related to emergency situations rather than to physical healthcare in general. While it is undoubtedly desirable that mental health nurses deliver routine screening, monitoring, and health promotion it may not be sufficient to conflate these outcomes with those relevant to emergency care or severe physiological deterioration.

Limitations

Any review is limited by the quality of included studies and those included here were not methodologically strong. Given that mental health inpatient services are common across the world it is possible that there may have been studies published in non-English languages that may have met the inclusion criteria. It is also possible that individual hospitals or services may have conducted audits of processes and outcomes in relation to, say, resuscitation training.

Implications for research

We cannot say with certainty how well prepared mental health nurses are prepared for dealing with physical emergencies and severe physiological deterioration. Further research is needed to systematically assess nurses’ attitudes, skills and knowledge and the translational impact of various educational interventions on patients’ safety and health outcomes research.

Conclusion
Although there are considerable gaps in the literature examining mental health nurses’ knowledge, skills and confidence in recognizing and managing mental health consumers who are physiologically deteriorating. The current review suggests that education alone does not guarantee change in attitudes and nursing practice. This has implications for managers and policy makers who need to put in place relevant, effective strategies for their nursing staff to support and adequately prepare them to manage such challenging situations, and develop monitoring and evaluative systems to ensure compliance and measure consumers’ outcomes.

Contribution of the paper

'What is already known about the topic?'

- People with mental illness have higher rates of all-cause mortality than those without mental illness.
- Until recently very little was known about the effectiveness of emergency medical care provided by mental health nurses for their patients.
- A growing body of empirical literature has emerged in recent years.

'What this paper adds'

- There is some overlap between research into routine physical health care and emergency medical care.
- Intervention studies for improving relevant skills of mental health nurses are largely of low quality; more rigorous evaluation is required.
- The review found there are no validated instruments to investigate mental health nurses’ emergency medical care-related attitudes.
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Figure 1: PRISMA flowchart
## Table 1a: Keywords used in the electronic database search (PEO format)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>((Mental health or psychiatr* or mental) and Nurs*).</td>
<td>(Medical Emergency OR Emergency Medicine OR Emergency Treatment OR Emergency Therapy OR Emergency Nursing OR Emergency Medical Services OR Emergency Care OR Emergency Health Services OR Medical Emergency Services OR Clinical Deterioration OR unexpected death or cardiopulmonary arrest or severe clinical deterioration or escalating care or rapid response systems or core physiological observations or emergency assistance or unplanned transfer to higher level care or cardiac arrest or intensive care unit readmission or repeat rapid response system calls OR simulation)</td>
<td>(education OR preparation OR training OR knowledge OR experience OR belief OR opinion OR attitude* OR perception* OR values OR understanding OR knowledge OR skills)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 1b: Keywords used in the electronic database search (PICO format)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Comparator</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>((Mental health or psychiatr* or mental) and Nurs*).</td>
<td>AND (Medical Emergency OR Emergency Medicine OR Emergency Treatment OR Emergency Therapy OR Emergency Nursing OR Emergency Medical Services OR Emergency Care OR Emergency Health Services OR Medical Emergency Services OR Clinical Deterioration OR unexpected death or cardiopulmonary arrest or severe clinical deterioration or escalating care or rapid response systems or core physiological observations or emergency assistance or unplanned transfer to</td>
<td>AND Any or Waiting list OR Placebo OR Repeated Measures</td>
<td>AND (education OR preparation OR training OR knowledge OR experience OR belief OR opinion OR attitud* OR perception* OR values OR understanding OR knowledge OR skills)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| higher level care or cardiac arrest or intensive care unit readmission or repeat rapid response system call) AND (Training or Education OR Preparation OR Simulation OR Policy OR Guideline) |  |  |  |
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Table 2: Intervention evaluation study quality assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Selection Bias</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Confounders</th>
<th>Blinding</th>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Withdrawals</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puskar et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermanns et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynn (2011)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsworth et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaddel et al. (2014)</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwick &amp; Withnell</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddad et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulose et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavelle et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3: Cross-sectional, observational studies quality assessment (adapted from National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study population clearly specified and defined</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations and in the same time period</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study pre-specified and applied uniformly to all</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome measures clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Total (max 7) | 6 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 |

x Condition achieved; - condition not achieved; NR = Not Reported;
Table 4: Quality appraisal of qualitative studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear statement of research aims</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative method appropriate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design appropriate to address research aims</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment strategy appropriate to study aims</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collected in a way that addressed the research issue</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher-participant relationship adequately considered</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical issues considered</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis rigorous</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear statement of findings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How valuable is the research?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (max 10)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5a: Included studies (Part 1: Interventional studies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Study Country</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Design.</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
<th>Main findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Puskar et al (2011)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Case study and retrospective longitudinal design</td>
<td>Psychiatric clinic statistics [emergency protocols activated, adverse patient outcomes]</td>
<td>Mental Health Nurses. No details of N or characteristics</td>
<td>Guidelines and annual mandatory training for Medical Emergency Team access: two Medical Emergency Team callout levels 1. C (Crisis); 2. A (Arrest). C allows early Medical Emergency Team referral. ‘No penalty’ clause for referring nurses</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Rise in Condition As and decline in Condition Cs. Reduction in adverse events (deaths, seizures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hermanns et al (2011)</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>Cross-sectional post-intervention.</td>
<td>9-item self-report Suicide Clinical Simulation Evaluation Tool. Observation. Student vocalisation</td>
<td>N=10 student nurses</td>
<td>30-min educational simulation of attempted suicide by hanging involving a manikin.</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Understanding of metabolic and physiological changes $\mu(SD)=1.4$ (0.49) where $1$ = ‘strongly agree’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wynn (2011)</td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>Longitudinal pre-post</td>
<td>Lasater (2007) Clinical</td>
<td>N=20 Mental Health</td>
<td>Educational simulations of diabetic medical conditions using HPS. ‘Live’ scenarios</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Significant improved pre- post- test CJR scores. All students improved by Time B. 80% participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Sample Size and Details</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judgment Rubric (CJR). Diabetes-related medical transfer data. Satisfaction.</td>
<td>Nurses in a Veterans Mental Health Hospital. allow reaction to participants’ decisions e.g., mistakes can result in cardiac arrest satisfied. Number of medical emergencies involving patients with diabetes fell 55% in post-intervention month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shadde l et al (2014)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Longitudinal AB</td>
<td>Two vignettes and a 1-item self-confidence in clinical nursing staff in 2 forensic units and Introduction of Modified early Warning Score (Wirral Community NHS Trust 2012) 15 minutes training on using MEWS.</td>
<td>Three wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
<td>Outcome Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadwick &amp; Withnell (2016)</td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>Longitudinal AB</td>
<td>N=95</td>
<td>1-d educational simulation involving Human Patient Simulators.</td>
<td>Proportion self-rating in top two GSES categories increased on all 10-items Mdn +36.0% (range +16.0% to +49.0%). Chi squared analyses of high/ moderate confidence vs. slight/no confidence all significant &lt;.01 (Cramer’s VM[SD]=.37[.12], range .21-.52.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddad et al. (2016)</td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>Longitudinal AB</td>
<td>N=49</td>
<td>Introduction of personal health plan for patients, and an education session on physical health assessment and management of patients with severe mental health problems</td>
<td>Cardiac Arrest M[SD] A 4.2(0.69) B 4.3(.67) P&gt;.05 Hypoglycaemia: M[SD] A 3.8 (0.82) B 3.85 (.89) P&gt;.05 Hyperglycaemia M[SD] A 3.6 (1.1) B 3.8 (1.01) P&lt;.05 Hedge’s g = -0.2 (small)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Study design.</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
<th>Main findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Paulose et al (2016)</td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>Longitudinal AB</td>
<td>Semi-structured knowledge questionnaires regarding heart attack respiratory arrest, convulsion, hypoglycaemia</td>
<td>N=30 psychiatric staff nurses. Mdn experience 6-12 months</td>
<td>Education. Self-Instruction Modules provided.</td>
<td>Group.</td>
<td>M(SD) AB scores: Heart Attack 3.5(.77) v 6.3 (.66) 80 p&lt;.0001; Hedge’s g = 3.80; Respiratory arrest 3.3 (1.08) v 6.4 (.73) p&lt;.0001 ; Hedge’s g = 3.28; Convulsion 2.9(1.24) v 5.8(.40) p&lt;.0001, Hedge’s g = 3.07; Hypoglycaemia 2.8(.81) v 5.6(.40) p&lt;.0001, Hedge’s g 4.27. Overall Max. score 26 p&lt;.05?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lavelle et al (2017)</td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>Longitudinal AB, Mixed methods.</td>
<td>Quantitative questionnaires: knowledge, confidence, and attitudes. Incident reporting for 7 months pre-</td>
<td>n=36 Mental Health Nurses and n=17 others attended</td>
<td>0.5-day educational simulation using high fidelity mannequin. Scenarios including</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Knowledge total (Cohen’s d = .7) confidence total (d = .52) and attitudes (d = .34) all changed significantly pre-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Post-Intervention</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fernando et al (2018)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Longitudinal AB</td>
<td>Self-evaluation form, 21-item questionnaire examining knowledge, attitudes, and confidence</td>
<td>63 nurses and junior doctors (15 [24%] Mental Health Nurses)</td>
<td>Educational simulation, 1-d Simulation Workshop at the Mental-Physical Interface (SWAMPI). Most scenarios about respiratory arrest, hanging, choking.</td>
<td>Increased post-training. For meds issues, illness and injury, suicide and self-harm. Qualitative: themes: confidence (up), team working skills (improved), communications skills (greater), reflective practice (better), personal responsibility (more).</td>
<td>Improvements in knowledge, attitudes, and confidence (all large effect size $\eta^2 = 0.63, 0.25, 0.61$ respectively).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Course evaluation form yes/no answers plus open questions. Tools guided by the literature and piloted prior to use. | psychiatric emergencies but one about medical deterioration. Learning Objectives were: Medical deterioration in psychiatry - Prevention of medical emergencies – Inter-professional working between general and psychiatric hospital | Satisfaction ratings 99% Qualitative: Inter-professional learning, leadership and teamwork, reflection, communication |

1 Cramer’s V 0.1 = Small Effect Size, 0.3 = Medium, 0.5 = Large (Cohen, 1988); ²Hedge’s g 0.2 = Small Effect Size, 0.5 = Medium, 0.8 = Large. N.B. Hedge’s g = 1 indicates the two groups differ by 1 SD, Hedge’s g = 2 indicates they differ by 2 SDs. and so on. ³Cohen’s d 0.2 = Small Effect Size, 0.5 = Medium, 0.8 = Large; η² Small effect size = 0.01, Medium = 0.06, Large = 0.14
Table 5b: Included studies (Part 2: Non-interventional studies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Study design.</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
<th>Main findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shanley (2012)</td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>Cross-sectional. Qualitative</td>
<td>Interviews. Grounded theory.</td>
<td>N=6 Mental Health Nurses. with experience of a suicide</td>
<td>Previous direct exposure to on-ward suicide of a patient.</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Emotional and psychological effects combined with managing an extremely challenging clinical situation. Challenges included immediate shock at finding dead/dying patient and somatic anxiety. Felt blame would be apportioned by managers. Did not feel they had made an error but found ‘closure’ difficult.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenkane et al (2011)</th>
<th>not reported</th>
<th>Cross-sectional, unmatched case control.</th>
<th>24-item questionnaire on core interventions and mastery of specific skills related to violence management including 7 items (α=.86) relating to 'Life support skills and safety in potential violent situation'</th>
<th>N=260 Registered Nurses/Practical Mental Nurses†/Managers in forensic wards</th>
<th>None/routine practice</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>89% of Registered Nurses report Registered Nurses to have ‘extremely or fairly well’ mastery of related knowledge and skills but only 52% rated PMNs similarly; 74% of Managers rated Registered Nurses to have mastery but only 42% of PMNs. 72% of PMNs self-assess as having mastery; 68% rate Registered Nurses as having mastery. Objectively, PMNs/Registered Nurses overrate their own mastery though PMNs more so.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Medical Emergency Team utilization/routine practice</th>
<th>Beliefs</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Perceived barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Herisko et al (2013)</td>
<td>Cross-sectional qualitative</td>
<td>Group interview with 14 questions structured around a survey questionnaire used in Jones et al.</td>
<td>Mental Health Nurses. N=7 convenience sample from aged, adult, and child &amp; adolescent care settings</td>
<td>Medical Emergency Team</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Beliefs: Mental Health Nurses work with patients with complex medical problems; know Medical Emergency Team criteria; training is adequate; Medical Emergency Team is preventative; aids patient management, is educational; Attitudes: Glad Medical Emergency Team exists, it is not over used; confident would call Medical Emergency Team if warranted; Perceived barriers: Increased workload and disruptive; lack of experience with and participation in Medical Emergency Team; unfamiliarity with patients; unsure if symptoms meet criteria; House Officer can transfer without calling Medical Emergency Team so call them first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Robson &amp; Haddad (2012); Robson et al (2013)</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>Physical Health Attitudes Scale for Mental Health Nurses (Robson &amp; Haddad, 2012). Items related to patient cardiac arrest and symptoms of hyperglycaemia.</td>
<td>N=585 Mental Health Nurses. 62.2% F; Mdn Age 31-40; 55.8% White; Years qualified</td>
<td>None/ routine practice</td>
<td>NHS Mental Health Trust</td>
<td>‘I am confident that I could resuscitate a client who had a cardiac arrest’ 420/575 (73.0%) agreed. M(SD) 3.83 (0.92). ‘I am confident in assessing signs and symptoms of hypo-glycaemia’: Hypoglycaemia: 390/578 (67.4%) agreed. M(SD) 3.67(0.92). Hyperglycaemia: 366/578 (63.3) M(SD) 3.61(0.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flood et al (2014)</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey, unmatched case control.</td>
<td>Self-report ‘awareness of RRR’, Resuscitation training and experience. Compliance with RRR Standard 4: Units where rapid tranquilisation, physical intervention, or seclusion used to have access to staff trained in immediate life support. Errors reported</td>
<td>N=393 staff (280 ‘frontline’) from 19 of 58 possible mental health care providers</td>
<td>Rapid Response Report/routine practice</td>
<td>National Aware of RRR: 21% of community staff, 36% of frontline staff, 50% of senior/managerial staff. <strong>Training:</strong> Basic Life Support 57%, 48%, 42% Any training reported: 61%, 82%, 83%; Immediate life support 2%, 25%, 31%; <strong>Experience:</strong> Yes: 26%, 27%, 48% 67% compliance reported with action 4. <strong>Qualitative feedback:</strong> Not enough training around emergency drug administration; skills and knowledge around working with elderly people lacking. <strong>Errors reported</strong> pre- and post- RRR. Pre- death 18, severe mod 8; Post 5, 8. (NB time periods not equal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Level of Analysis</th>
<th>Main Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Herisko et al (2015)</td>
<td>not reported</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>17-item Mental Health Nurses’ attitudes and perceived barriers about modified Medical Emergency Team Survey. One open-ended question. Descriptive statistics only.</td>
<td>Registered Nurses. N=102. M age=40. 76.5% F. 38.2%; MH experience 9.3-years</td>
<td>Medical Emergency Team utilization.</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>4-‘Factors’: Patient focused (complexity of patients); Positive forces for calling the Medical Emergency Team; Negative forces for calling the Medical Emergency Team; Seeking assistance. Internal reliability .78. Changes to training made as a result of the results and a problem solving algorithm. Describe as being ‘liked’ but no numbers presented. Negative forces for calling a Medical Emergency Team statements more strongly agreed with (M 71) than positive forces (M=51). Strong agreement that physical healthcare for psychiatric patients is complex (M=76% agree).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Manu et al (2015)</td>
<td>Feb-Nov 2012</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey</td>
<td>Rapid Response Team activations from a 222-bed psychiatric hospital.</td>
<td>N=169. Rapid Response Team activations. 72.8% by Mental Health</td>
<td>None/ routine practice</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>169 activations made by 72.8% staff nurses, 5.9% nurse practitioners, 21.3% others. 64.5% Rapid Response Team calls made for acute change of condition, 26.2% Abnormal physiological parameter, 8.3% non-specific concern. Resulted in: Rapid Response Team transferred 127 (75.2%) to ED; ED physicians decided n=46 (27.2%) required admission. ‘Appears to break with traditional pattern of...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wynade n et al (2016)</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey.</td>
<td>Physical Health Attitudes Scale for Mental Health Nurses (see Robson &amp; Haddad, 2012)</td>
<td>N=170. 63.3% F; Mdn age 31-44;</td>
<td>None/routine practice</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Cardiac Arrest 140/170 (82.3%) agreed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ganiah et al (2017)</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Cross-sectional survey.</td>
<td>Physical Health Attitudes Scale for Mental Health Nurses (see Robson &amp; Haddad, 2012). Arabic translation.</td>
<td>N=225 Mental Health Nurses M age 32.5 (7.22) 59.9% M.</td>
<td>None/routine practice</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Cardiac Arrest A 136/225 (67.3) 3.73 (1.04).11(0.79) Hypoglycaemia: 150/225 (74.3) 3.88 (0.97) Hyperglycaemia: 144/225 (64.0%) 3.89 (0.94) Also did top items re training needs none of which are emergency stuff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nurses. No details of N or characteristics.
### 20 Gebreegziabher et al (2017) Ethiopia
Cross-sectional survey, unmatched case control
Purpose-designed questionnaire: attitude (10-items) and skills (8-items) about Basic Life Support and Advanced Cardiovascular Life Support based on UK Resuscitation Council (2010) Guidelines and American Heart Association (2005) accreditation criteria
N=461 (66.4% M) final year undergraduate students. 14 (3.0% Mental Health Nurse students)
None/routine practice
Hospital
Mental Health Nurses ($M [SD] = 7.3[1.8]$) no different to other professions on attitude scores; significantly less skilled ($M [SD] = 1.7[1.8]$) than anaesthetist participants (3.9[1.4]) but not others. N.B. all professions mean skill scores below adequate. Mental Health Nurses least likely to believe that they were adequately equipped to perform CPR nut few other substantial differences.

### 21 Bressington et al (2018) Qatar, Hong
Cross-sectional survey, unmatched
Physical Health Attitudes Scale for Mental Health Nurses (see Robson & Haddad, 2012)
N=481 Mental Health Nurses (39%)
None/routine practice
National/International
Cardiac Arrest: Qatar 119/136 (86) 4.18 (0.77); HK 124/143 (87) 4.09 (0.71); Japan 89/200 (45) 3.2 (0.99);
Hypoglycaemia: Qatar 132/138 (96) 4.34 (0.62); HK 125/143 (87) 4.11 (0.64); Japan 91/200 (46) 3.5 (0.87).
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| Kong, Japan | case control | and Physical Health Attitudes Scale for Mental Health Nurses translated into Japanese | response rate | Hyperglycaemia: Qatar: 128/138 (93) 4.25 (90.60); HK 113/143 (79) 3.92 (0.67); Japan 65/200 (33) 3.04 (0.86). Personal correspondence, Bressington, April 2018. |

†Registered Nurses are licensed professionals; Practical Mental Nurses have vocational training only