Fig 10 Response protocol

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Berrow | Kewstoke | Harptree | Steepholm | Emergency Dept |
| 10 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 1 |

Table 2: Number of reports by ward of origin

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Anonymous reports | Named reportees |
| 22 | 3 |

Table 3: Number of reports submitted anonymously

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Red (high risk) | Amber (medium risk) | Green (low risk) | Uncategorised |
| 5 | 13 | 6 | 1 |

Table 4: Number of reports by risk level

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Medical | Nursing | Administration | Pharmacy | Management | IT | Lab and investigation | Communications | Facilities |
| 6 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 |

Table 5: Number of reports by type of problem

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Fixed | 1. Complex, refer for QI | 1. Mitigated and refer for QI |
| ? | ???? | ?????????? |

Table 6: Number of reports by outcome {not possible to categorize outcomes in this way by end of trial period because unclear categorisation/outcome}

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| “Doctor” | F1 | F2 | SHO |
| 16 | 6 | 1 | 2 |

Table 7: Number of reports by doctor’s grade