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Background

• Bad news delivery’s impact: worldwide concern
• SMILE Centre: the TAKE 5 program

→ Could it improve bad news delivery performances, such as longer course programs?
Materials and method

- **Preliminary study** conducted in the Emergency Department
- Data extracted from a 5-month period between November 2015 and April 2016
- **Three phases** over 4 weeks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1 (week 1)</th>
<th>Phase 2 (week 2)</th>
<th>Phase 3 (week 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video recorded individual role-playing sessions</td>
<td>3-hour theoretical training group session</td>
<td>Video recorded individual role-playing sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Evaluation**
  - SPIKES competence form – short form\(^a\)
  - IES-R scale\(^b\)


Results (N=14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>BN delivery duration T1</th>
<th>BN delivery duration T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trainees (n=10)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6♀ / 4♂</td>
<td>8’20’’</td>
<td>10’30’’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior physicians (n=4)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4♀</td>
<td>13’18’’</td>
<td>9’34’’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPIKES**
- T1 junior physicians: Score
- T3 junior physicians: Score
- T1 Trainees: Score
- T3 Trainees: Score

**IES-R**
- T1 junior physicians: Score
- T3 junior physicians: Score
- T1 Trainees: Score
- T3 Trainees: Score

Significant differences:
- p<.001
- p=.006
- p=.009
- p=.01
- p=.037
- p=.001
Conclusions

• Preliminary results
  – communication skills
  – physicians’ stress

• A larger sample, measures of subjective and objective stress, and double-blinded video analyses
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