

Development of a List of Competencies and Entrustable Professional Activities for Resident Physicians During Death Pronouncement: A Modified Delphi Study

Takaomi Kessoku

Yokohama City University Hospital: Yokohama Shiritsu Daigaku Fuzoku Byoin <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5587-1386>

Yu Uneno (✉ yuuneno@kuhp.kyoto-u.ac.jp)

Kyoto University

Yuka Urushibara-Miyach

Kyoto University: Kyoto Daigaku

Kiyofumi Oya

Iizuka Hospital: Iizuka Byoin

Akihiko Kusakabe

Yokohama Shiritsu Daigaku

Atsushi Nakajima

Yokohama Shiritsu Daigaku

Noritoshi Kobayashi

Yokohama City University: Yokohama Shiritsu Daigaku

Yasushi Ichikawa

Yokohama City University: Yokohama Shiritsu Daigaku

Mitsunori Miyashita

Tohoku University: Tohoku Daigaku

Manabu Muto

Kyoto University: Kyoto Daigaku

Masanori Mori

Seirei Mikatahara Hospital: Seirei Mikatahara Byoin

Tatsuya Morita

Seirei Mikatahara Hospital: Seirei Mikatahara Byoin

Research article

Keywords: Delphi, competencies, death pronouncement, entrustable professional activities, resident physicians

Posted Date: June 30th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-668237/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at BMC Medical Education on February 22nd, 2022. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03149-5>.

Abstract

Purpose: Appropriate delivery of death pronouncements potentially affects bereaved families' wellbeing positively. Younger physicians need to learn death pronouncement skills; currently, the competencies and entrustable professional activities (EPAs) in death pronouncement practice have not been clarified.

Therefore, this study aimed to develop a list of competencies and EPAs necessary for death pronouncement practice, which resident physicians need to acquire by the end of their residency training (postgraduate year 2).

Methods: An anonymous modified Delphi study was conducted with a panel of 31 experts. The experts were invited online from general wards in hospitals with resident physicians across Japan to participate in the study using the purposive and snowball sampling method. A non-anonymous web conference was held with three additional external evaluators to finalize the item list. The consensus criterion was defined as a mean response of at least 4 points on a 5-point Likert scale for each competency and EPA item and a rating of 4 or 5 points by at least 80% of the participants.

Results: Consensus was achieved, with consistently high levels of agreement across panel members, on 11 competencies and 9 EPA items. Additionally, a correspondence matrix table between competencies and EPAs was developed.

Conclusions: This study clarified the standardized educational outcomes for knowledge, skills, and attitudes in death pronouncement practice and the level of physicians who can perform this practice independently, serving as a blueprint to aid the development of an educational model and evaluation method for clinical educational institutions and developers of medical school curriculums.

Introduction

Death pronouncement is one of the most challenging clinical practices, especially for younger physicians [1–3]. Physician-patient-family communication through the death pronouncement practice is critically important, as it potentially affects the families' emotional and psychological wellbeing either positively or negatively (e.g., acute grief and long-term depression) [4]. This is because the death of a loved one is a critically serious life event for the family members and relatives of the deceased [4, 5]. Appropriate death pronouncement practice itself can potentially be a type of bereavement care for family members [6, 7].

Recently, better ways to deliver the death pronouncement have been actively investigated. Kusakabe et al. reported that family members responded positively toward physicians' behaviors such as acting calmly (not rushed), having a suitable appearance for the situation, introducing themselves to the family members, and explicitly explaining the cause of death [8]. Hatano et al. revealed that bereaved caregivers did not appreciate automatic or routine pronouncement behaviors in a palliative care unit setting [9]. Mori et al., using randomized and scripted video-vignettes, found that physician behavior evaluated favorably by family members included five components: "waiting until the families calm themselves down, explaining that the physician has received a sign-out containing information of the patient's condition, performing the examination respectfully, ascertaining the time of death with a wristwatch, and reassuring the families that the patient did not experience pain" [7, p. 191–192]. Moreover, multiple educational models regarding death pronouncement practice that describe the step-by-step procedure (e.g., the GRIEV_ING model) have been proposed and investigated [10–15]. Previous studies have shown that compassionate and calm behavior throughout the practice is universally important regardless of the specific cultural context.

Despite the cumulative evidence of better ways to deliver the death pronouncement, a consensus has never been developed on the standardized educational outcomes for knowledge, skills, and attitudes in death pronouncement practice, or about the skill level of physicians who can perform this practice independently. Rooted in a criticism of knowledge-oriented education and a social demand to clarify standardized educational outcomes, nowadays, competency-based education that clarifies defined knowledge, skills, and attitudes that learners need to acquire has been attracting attention [16]. Moreover, to translate competency into action, clarifying the entrustable professional activities (EPAs) is also widely recognized as important [17, 18]. An EPA is a unit of professional practice that can be fully entrusted to a trainee with sufficient competence to execute the activity unsupervised [18]. In daily practice, younger physicians often need to deliver the death pronouncement without mentor supervision. Developing EPAs is, therefore, critical, as clarifying the kind of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that younger physicians need to acquire would potentially promote educational goal setting and work-based assessment, ultimately positively affecting the bereaved families' wellbeing [19–21].

The aim of this study is to develop a list of the competencies and EPAs of physicians' behaviors in death pronouncement practice, which resident physicians need to acquire by the time of completion of their residency training (postgraduate year 2).

Methods

Figure 1 shows the flow of this study. First, the extant literature was reviewed narratively, and an expert panel was selected using the purposive and snowball sampling method. Then, Delphi rounds were held using web technology. Competencies and EPA items identified by the Delphi rounds were confirmed and discussed through a non-anonymous web conference between the expert panel and three external evaluators. Lastly, another Delphi round was held to finalize the competency and EPA items. The process is described in detail in the following subsections. The Delphi process was conducted between August 2020 and January 2021 in Japan according to the Guidance on Conducting and Reporting Delphi Studies [22].

Design

The current study was conducted using a modified Delphi method. This method is widely accepted as a scientific consensus-building method and recognized as one of the best methods to develop competency in an objective and scientifically valid manner [19]. As multiple studies regarding death pronouncement have previously been reported, it was considered that interactive discussions among panel members could generate novel findings, for which the modified Delphi method was suitable compared with other techniques, including the Delphi method.

Expert panel selection

All panel members were recruited using purposive sampling and snowball sampling [20]. In the Delphi method, consensus formed in a group consisting of panel members with diverse backgrounds and perspectives on the topic for which consensus is sought is likely to be of higher quality and to produce more widely acceptable results than consensus formed in a group comprising members with nearly homogeneous characteristics [20]. Therefore, the panel members were selected through consensus among the researchers to ensure heterogeneity in terms of age, organization, and years of clinical and professional experience and expertise. To reduce the selection bias, we avoided convenience sampling and made efforts to invite suitable experts in this field nationwide with dedicated discussion along with researchers and panel candidates.

The inclusion criteria were physicians and nurses who 1) were involved in end-of-life care and death pronouncement in daily practice and 2) had experienced death pronouncement practice for 50 or more patients. The exclusion criteria were 1) persons with mental or physical disabilities or disorders that could interfere with participation in the research and 2) those whom the researcher deemed unsuitable to participate in the research.

Although panel member size for the Delphi method varies in the literature, it is generally recommended to have at least 20 members [22]. Assuming a response rate of approximately 80% based on previous studies, the required initial recruitment number was 25 [23].

Delphi process

First, the researchers performed a thorough narrative literature review and developed a draft version of the competencies and EPAs item list. Because this study's focus was on physicians in a residency training program, the general ward of hospitals, where most physicians work, was the focused setting.

Second, we constructed a web-based questionnaire using Google Forms®, posted the draft version of the item list, and asked the panel members to respond to each item using a 5-point Likert scale to indicate their perspective on whether or not the item should be included in the list. The response options were 1 (should definitely be excluded), 2 (should be excluded), 3 (neither), 4 (should be included), and 5 (should definitely be included). In addition, there was a free text option for the panel members to make suggestions regarding any modification in wording or addition of other items. The web URL of the questionnaire was sent via email to the panel members, and they were asked to answer the questionnaire independently. Revisions to the items were made according to the panel members' responses and discussion among researchers. Based on previous literature [20, 23], and discussion within the research team, the consensus criteria to retain items from the draft list were set as 1) average of 4 points or higher on the 5-point Likert scale and 2) more than 80% of the panel members rating it as 4 or 5. The rounds were repeated until the consensus criteria were satisfied.

To ensure anonymity and autonomous response, the list of panel members was blinded among the members and responses were assigned individual codes. Researchers could recognize the link between the code and response, but the link between the response and the individual's name was blinded.

A consensus meeting was held in a non-anonymous face-to-face web conference with three additional external evaluators, including a patient representative, a residency physician, and an experienced clinical educator, to assess the face validity of the list of items developed through the first and second Delphi rounds. We considered that the participation of patient representatives who underwent death pronouncement delivery, resident physicians who were the focused target of this study, and clinical educators who would be the users of output from this study as essential for this research, and we invited them using the purposive sampling method. After the consensus meeting, the final version of the item list was developed through a third Delphi round with the attendees of the consensus meeting.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the data using JMP version 15.0 software (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA).

Results

Expert panel characteristics and response rates

Table 1 summarizes the participant characteristics. The response rate was 31/31 (100%) in the first and second rounds among the 31 experts participating in this study. A total of 15 participants (48%) were male, and 15 (48%) were 40–49 years old; 17 out of 31 (55%) were physicians (specialties: internal medicine=5, palliative medicine=3, pediatrics=3) and 14 were nurses (oncology=3, emergency medicine=2, intensive care=2, palliative care=2, psychiatric=2); 19 (61%) participants had more than 20 years of clinical experience. Fifteen of the 31 experts were surveyed (48%), and the three external evaluating members participated in the non-anonymous web conference. The third Delphi round targeted the 18 members who attended the web consensus meeting, and 17 out of them (94%) responded.

First Delphi round

The results of the first Delphi round are shown in Supplemental Table 1. Eight of the ten (80%) competency items were judged to be appropriate by consensus criteria, while two (20%) competency items led to disagreements. In the researcher meeting, minor corrections were made to the eight agreed-upon items, consistent with the panelists' comments. Similarly, the two items for which no consensus was reached were modified according to the panelists' comments. One of the competency items, "Recognize the history of patients' and family members' life and illness trajectory" was split into two items, consistent with the panel members' comments. Nine of the 10 (90%) EPA items were judged to be appropriate; consensus could not be reached for one item (10%). For this EPA item, revisions were made as per panel members' comments, and it was added in the second round. Additionally, as a result of free comments from the panel, one EPA item ("Explain the cause of death") was added to the list in the second round. Thus, a total of 11 competency items and 9 EPA items were selected for the second Delphi round.

Second Delphi round

Results of the second-round survey are shown in Supplemental Table 2. A total of 10 of the 11 (91%) competency items were judged to be appropriate by consensus, but one (9%) competency item (competency 2; “Awareness to understand the life of patients and their families so far”) did not meet the consensus criteria. Eight of 9 (89%) EPA items were judged to be appropriate, but one (11%) EPA item (EPA 6; “Explain the cause of death”) was not. Thus, a total of 10 competency items and 9 EPA items were selected for the face-to-face web consensus meeting.

Face-to-face web consensus meeting

As a result of discussions at the consensus meeting with four researchers, 15 panel members, and three external evaluators, competency 10, “Understand their own limitation,” and competency 12, “Reflect on the whole process of their own practice,” were added (Supplemental Table 3).

Third Delphi round

Results of the third-round survey are shown in Supplemental File 3. A total of 11 of the 12 (92%) competency items were judged to be appropriate by consensus, but 1 (8%; competency 10 “Understand their own limitation”) did not meet the consensus criteria. All 9 of the (100%) EPA items were judged to be appropriate. After the third round, the 11 competency and 9 EPA items were fixed as the final version based on the consensus (Tables 2 and 3). Two novel items that had not been referred to in previous literature, reflection and coping skills, were identified through consensus. Additionally, we created a matrix of competencies and EPAs consistent with the discussion among panel members, external evaluators, and researchers (Table 4).

Discussion

Main findings

This study developed a list of competencies and EPAs for physicians’ behaviors in patient death pronouncement practice with a considerably high response and consensus rate. The development of the matrix of competencies and EPAs potentially helps educators to identify the competencies that learners need to acquire before performing an EPA [17,24]. We previously published a paper regarding the practical guidelines on physicians’ behavior on the death pronouncement practice [25,26]; the practical guidance is a subordinate concept to EPAs and provides more specific and detailed tips for clinical practice. These educational materials—competencies, EPAs, and practical guidance—would provide important insights into the development of more concrete and realistic educational models and their evaluation methods.

Various recommendations regarding physicians’ behaviors throughout death pronouncement practice have been proposed, and our competency and EPA items are highly compatible with these recommendations. For example, Hobgood et al. proposed a practical framework called GRIEV_ING [13]. The elements of GRIEV_ING (e.g., verify, tell family members the fact of bereavement in a straight manner, educate and provide space; communicate with compassion for family members) match well with our items. Hallenbeck’s report (e.g., calm yourself, be aware of your own emotional wellbeing, respond simply to immediate reactions and questions, and be cognizant of family members’ uncertainties regarding emotion or acceptance toward the situation) is also consistent with our items [2]. The findings of the present study would contribute to recognizing the essential components and the comprehensive picture of the death pronouncement practice.

Strengths and limitations

The strength of this study lies in its method and in the expertise of the panel of experts who participated. The modified Delphi design is ideal for reaching a strong consensus, and the expertise and diversity of specialties among participants allowed us to gain a wide range of perspectives.

There are several possible limitations of this study. First, at the consensus conference and in the third Delphi round, the participation rate of the original panel members decreased. Due to the spread of COVID-19, we faced challenges in conducting on-site face-to-face meetings and adjusting the schedules of all panel members; nevertheless, we tried to get as many participants as possible. Second, the target setting of this study was general wards in hospitals and resident physicians, which can limit the external validity of the findings, such that they may not be applicable to other settings, including experienced physicians, emergency rooms, intensive care units, or home care settings. Third, this study was conducted within the cultural context of Japan. Patients, family members, and healthcare professionals in Japan tend to value relationships more than autonomy [27,28]. Factors including religion, spirituality, or attitude toward the dead person in other cultural contexts may affect the item composition of the competencies and EPAs list. However, our list can serve as a blueprint to aid the efforts to develop an educational model and evaluation method for clinical educational institutions and developers of medical school curriculums.

What this study adds

In our study, two novel items, reflection and coping skills, were identified through consensus. Being reflective is an important characteristic of healthcare professionals [29]. While clinical practice as a whole requires reflection, a specific clinical practice with no definitive guidelines, such as death pronouncement, may require practitioners to have a more dedicated attitude to reflect on their own practice. Adding reflection to the competencies and EPAs would emphasize this skill for younger physicians’ education and training. Moreover, since the mental health of healthcare professionals is also important, and death pronouncement can be especially burdensome for younger physicians, it is important for learners to be aware of the potential distress arising from it. This may alleviate feelings of professional loneliness and help prevent burnout.

Conclusion

A list of competencies and EPAs for physicians’ behaviors in patients’ death pronouncement practice was developed, and two novel items, reflection and coping skills, were identified with consensus as crucial components. This list is expected to aid efforts to develop educational models based on these

competencies and EPAs. Furthermore, examining the efficacy of such educational models is warranted.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The research protocol for this study was approved by [Blinded for review] University Institutional Review Board (approval number: A191100009). All panel members and external evaluators, including a patient representative, were given a sufficient explanation of the research intent in advance, and written consent to participate in the research was obtained from all participants.

Funding: The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This work was supported by the Japan Hospice Palliative Care Foundation.

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethics approval: The research protocol for this study was approved by Yokohama City University Institutional Review Board (approval number: A191100009).

Consent to participate: All panel members and external evaluators, including a patient representative, were given a sufficient explanation of the research intent in advance, and written consent to participate in the research was obtained from all participants.

Consent for publication: Written informed consent was obtained from all panel members for publication.

Availability of data and material: The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Code availability: N/A

Author contributions: All authors made substantial contributions to the manuscript, including to the conception (TK, YU, OK, YM) and design (TK, YU, OK, YM, AK) of the study, to the literature search (TK, YU, OK, YM, AN, NK, YI, MMiyashita, MMuto, MMori, TM), collection of the data (TK, YU, OK, YM), and to the draft and final revision of the manuscript (all authors). All authors provided final approval of the final version and its submission.

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank all the Delphi panel participants (Hiroyuki Otani, Eriko Satomi, Ryo Kamiya, Jun Sasaki, Yusuke Takamiya, Masahiko Inamori, Koji Hanaki, Tetsuo Hori, Kenji Numata, Kei Ouchi, Jun Nagayama, Mieko Okazaki, Etsuko Miyagi, Dai Yumino, Tomio Suzuki, Yoichi Nakamura, Kazue Asano, Megumi Koga, Junko Sasaki, Yuko Sumi, Yuri Tabata, Eriko Hayashi, Mayuko Miyazaki, Mari Watanabe, Emiko Komatsu, Mai Yasutake, Kei Nakamura, Kazuki Furuya, Miyoko Kuwata) and external evaluators (Yukari Ohata, Tadayuki Hashimoto, Chihiro Nohara) for their input.

References

1. Kusakabe A, Nozato J, Hirano K, et al (2020) "Guidebook on doctors' behaviors for death diagnosis created by community healthcare providers" changed residents' mind for death diagnosis. *J Palliat Care* 825859720951698.
2. Hallenbeck J (2005) Palliative care in the final days of life: "they were expecting it at any time". *JAMA* 293(18):2265–2271.
3. Fraser HC, Kutner JS, Pfeifer MP (2001) Senior medical students' perceptions of the adequacy of education on end-of-life issues. *J Palliat Med* 4(3):337–343.
4. Steinhauser KE, Christakis NA, Clipp EC, et al (2000) Factors considered important at the end of life by patients, family, physicians, and other care providers. *JAMA* 284(19):2476–2482.
5. Krawczyk M, Gallagher R (2016) Communicating prognostic uncertainty in potential end-of-life contexts: experiences of family members. *BMC Palliat Care* 15:59.
6. Shinjo T, Morita T, Hirai K, et al. (2010) Who pronounced the patient's death? A study of the experience of bereaved Japanese families in palliative care units [in Japanese]. *Palliat Care Res* 5(2):162–170.
7. Mori M, Fujimori M, Hamano J, et al (2018) Which physicians' behaviors on death pronouncement affect family-perceived physician compassion? A randomized, scripted, video-vignette study. *J Pain Symptom Manage* 55(2):189–197.
8. Kusakabe A, Naito AS, Hirano K, et al (2016) Death pronouncements: recommendations based on a survey of bereaved family members. *J Palliat Med* 19(6):646–651.
9. Hatano Y, Morita T, Otani H, et al (2018) Physician behavior toward death pronouncement in palliative care units. *J Palliat Med* 21(3):368–372.
10. Bailey FA, Williams BR (2005) Preparation of residents for death pronouncement: a sensitive and supportive method. *Palliat Support Care* 3(2):107–114.
11. Pollack M (1999) Educating new resident physicians in death notification. *Acad Med* 74(6):721.
12. Marchand L, Kushner K (2004) Death pronouncements: using the teachable moment in end-of-life care residency training. *J Palliat Med* 7(1):80–84.
13. Hobgood C, Harward D, Newton K, Davis W (2005) The educational intervention "GRIEV_ING" improves the death notification skills of residents. *Acad Emerg Med* 12(4):296–301.
14. Hobgood CD, Tamayo-Sarver JH, Hollar DW Jr, Sawning S (2009) Griev_Inng: death notification skills and applications for fourth-year medical students. *Teach Learn Med* 21(3):207–219.

15. Nordstrom A, Fjellman-Wiklund A, Gysell T (2011) Drama as a pedagogical tool for practicing death notification-experiences from Swedish medical students. *BMC Med Educ* 11:74.
16. Frank JR, Snell LS, Cate OT, et al (2010) Competency-based medical education: theory to practice. *Med Teach* 32(8):638–645.
17. Ten Cate O (2013) Nuts and bolts of entrustable professional activities. *J Grad Med Educ* 5(1):157–158.
18. Ten Cate O, Taylor DR (2020) The recommended description of an entrustable professional activity: AMEE Guide No. 140. *Med Teach* Nov 9:1–9.
19. McKenna HP (1994) The Delphi technique: a worthwhile research approach for nursing? *J Adv Nurs* 19(6):1221–1225.
20. Hasson F, Keeney S, McKenna H (2000) Research guidelines for the Delphi survey technique. *J Adv Nurs* 32(4):1008–1015.
21. Dunn WR, Hamilton DD, Harden RM (1985) Techniques of identifying competencies needed of doctors. *Med Teach* 7(1):15–25.
22. Jünger S, Payne SA, Brine J (2017) Guidance on Conducting and REporting DElphi Studies (CREDES) in palliative care: recommendations based on a methodological systematic review. *Palliat Med* 31(8):684–706.
23. Dielissen P, Verdonk P, Bottema B, et al (2012) Expert consensus on gender criteria for assessment in medical communication education. *Patient Educ Couns* 88(2):189–195.
24. Ten Cate O (2014) Trusting graduates to enter residency: what does it take? *J Grad Med Educ* 6(1):7–10.
25. Kusakabe A, Otani Y, Kakuto A, et al (2013) [Usefulness of a manual on physician behavior at the time of death confirmation]. *Gan To Kagaku Ryoho* 40 Suppl 2:199–201.
26. Kusakabe A, Hirano K, Ikenaga K, et al (2014) [“Manual on physician behavior at the time of death certification” created through collaboration with different local healthcare workers]. *Gan To Kagaku Ryoho* 41 Suppl 1:42–44.
27. Matsumura S, Bito S, Liu H, et al (2002) Acculturation of attitudes toward end-of-life care: a cross-cultural survey of Japanese Americans and Japanese. *J Gen Intern Med* 17(7):531–539.
28. Shirado Naito A (2016) Preferences of patients with advanced cancer for advance care planning. *Palliat Care Res* 11(1):101–108.
29. Sandars J (2009) The use of reflection in medical education: AMEE Guide No. 44. *Med Teach* 31:685–95.

Tables

Table 1. Characteristics of Expert Panelists

	n	Percentage of Total (%)
Sex		
Male	15	48
Female	16	52
Age Range, y		
30–39	6	19
40–49	15	48
50–59	7	23
60–69	3	10
Occupation		
Physician	17	55
Nurse	14	45
Specialty		
Physician	17	100
Internal medicine	5	29
Psychiatrist	0	0
Surgery	2	12
Palliative medicine	3	18
Oncology	1	6
Emergency medicine	2	12
Pediatrics	3	18
Obstetrics and gynecology	1	6
Nurse	14	100
Oncology	3	21
Emergency medicine	2	14
Intensive care	2	14
Geriatric	1	7
Pediatric	1	7
Palliative care	2	14
Home care	1	7
Psychiatric	2	14
Clinical Experience, y		
5–9	0	0
10–19	12	39
20–29	15	48
≥30	4	13

Table 2. Competency List of Doctors' Behaviors during Death Diagnosis

Competency Item List	Mean	Consensus Rate, n (%)
1. Recognize patients' illness trajectory	4.8	17 (100)
2. Recognize importance of multidisciplinary approach to support patients and their family members	4.6	17 (100)
3. Be aware of your own emotional wellbeing	4.5	17 (100)
4. Cope with your own psychological distress properly	4.5	17 (100)
5. Treat the patients and their family members with respect	4.9	17 (100)
6. Examine patients in a correct medical manner	4.8	16 (94)
7. Be cognizant of the distress of bereaved family members	4.5	16 (94)
8. Communicate with compassion for family members' emotional distress	4.7	17 (100)
9. Be cognizant of family members' uncertainties regarding emotion or acceptance toward the situation	4.1	16 (94)
10. Be cognizant of the importance of behaving according to the individual	4.5	17 (100)
11. Reflect on the whole process of your own practice	4.3	16 (94)

Table 3. Entrustable Professional Activities in the Doctors' Behaviors during Death Diagnosis

Entrustable Professional Activities Item List	Mean	Consensus Rate, n (%)
1. Collect the background information of patients and their families in advance of encounter	4.5	15 (88)
2. Share information across clinical team members and provide bereavement care with a multidisciplinary approach	4.5	16 (94)
3. Keep yourself neat	4.8	16 (94)
4. Examine patients to confirm terminated vital signs	4.9	17 (100)
5. Tell family members the fact of bereavement in a straightforward manner	4.9	17 (100)
6. Communicate with compassion for family members	4.7	17 (100)
7. Discuss autopsy with attendant physician when appropriate	4.2	14 (82)
8. Issue a death certification, sharing the contents of the document with family members	4.5	16 (94)
9. Reflect on the whole process of you own practice with mentors or colleagues, when appropriate	4.4	17 (100)

Table 4. Mapping of Entrustable Professional Activities to a Subset of Competencies

J → Entrustable professional activities	1. Collect the background information of patients and their families in advance of encounter	2. Share information across clinical team members and provide bereavement care with a multidisciplinary approach	3. Keep yourself neat	4. Examine patients to confirm terminated vital signs	5. Tell family members the fact of bereavement in a straightforward manner	6. Communicate with compassion for family members	7. Discuss autopsy with attendant physician when appropriate	8. Issue a death certification, sharing the contents of the document with family members	9. Reflect on the whole process of your own practice with mentors/colleagues when appropriate
1. Recognize patients' illness trajectory	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2. Recognize importance of multidisciplinary approach to support patients and their family members	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>			
3. Be aware of your own emotional wellbeing		<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Cope with your own psychological distress properly		<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Treat the patients and their family members with respect			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
6. Examine patients in a correct medical manner			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		
7. Be cognizant of the distress of bereaved family members	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
8. Communicate with compassion for family members' emotional distress	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
9. Be cognizant of family members' uncertainties regarding emotion or acceptance toward the situation	<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
10. Be cognitive to importance to behave according to individuality.	<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	
11. Reflect the whole process of your own practice									<input type="checkbox"/>

Figures




Figure 1

Modified Delphi technique process used to develop competency and entrustable professional activities

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [SupplementalTable11.docx](#)
- [SupplementalTable21.docx](#)
- [SupplementalTable31.docx](#)