

# Point of Care: The Journal of Near-Patient Testing and Technology

## Critical care nurses' views and experiences of pre-analytical factors influencing point of care testing; a qualitative study

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	
<b>Full Title:</b>	Critical care nurses' views and experiences of pre-analytical factors influencing point of care testing; a qualitative study
<b>Article Type:</b>	Original Study
<b>Keywords:</b>	Point of care; nursing; qualitative; focus groups
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Suzanne Bench, PhD London South Bank University London, London UNITED KINGDOM
<b>Corresponding Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Corresponding Author's Institution:</b>	London South Bank University
<b>Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:</b>	
<b>First Author:</b>	Suzanne Bench, PhD
<b>First Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Suzanne Bench, PhD
<b>Order of Authors Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Manuscript Region of Origin:</b>	UNITED KINGDOM
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>The main users of point of care testing devices placed outside the central laboratory are clinicians, predominantly nurses. Understanding the factors influencing sample accuracy is important to ensure appropriate clinical decision making. Previous studies focus on the analysis process, however, errors can also occur during the pre-analytical phase, linked to user knowledge, skills and other factors associated with the wider context of care.</p> <p>This study explored adult critical care nurses' views about point of care testing, the challenges they experience and their suggestions on how the pre-analytic phase might be improved. Using a qualitative design, four focus group discussions took place with 60 critical care nurses studying at two London based Universities between April and July 2019. Anonymized and verbatim-transcribed focus group data were uploaded into NVivo11 and underwent a standard process of inductive thematic analysis. Findings suggest that nurses' concerns focus on three key areas: Training and competence; Sample frequency and volume; and impacts on patients, relatives and staff. Critical care nurses view POCT as a necessary task, which aids timely patient management. However, the process can detract nurses from performing other care duties. Being able to draw less blood was identified as an important way to increase patient comfort and to reduce risks.</p> <p>Collaborative working is key to ensure that improvements made to the pre-analytical process reflect users' needs. Ensuring best use of nurses' time by streamlining pre-analytical processes and ensuring equipment is readily available for use is important to ensure other clinical priorities can be achieved.</p>

12<sup>th</sup> June 2020

To the Editor

Please accept submission of this paper entitled:

*“Critical care nurses’ views and experiences of pre-analytical factors influencing point of care testing; a qualitative study”*

I hope that this paper will be considered suitable for publication within the journal and look forward to receiving the reviewers’ comments.

Yours sincerely

Professor Suzanne Bench (corresponding author)

[benchs@lsbu.ac.uk](mailto:benchs@lsbu.ac.uk)

## **Title**

Critical care nurses' views and experiences of pre-analytical factors influencing point of care testing; a qualitative study

## **Authors**

Suzanne Bench PhD, Professor of Nursing<sup>1</sup> & Deputy Director of Research (nursing)<sup>2</sup>

1. London Spinal Cord Injury Centre, Royal National Orthopaedic Hospital, England
2. London South Bank University. London, England

## **Corresponding author**

Professor Suzanne Bench

School of Health and Social Care, London South Bank University

103 Borough Road, London, SE1 0AA

Phone: +44 (0)20 7815 6797

Email: benches@lsbu.ac.uk

Twitter: @szbench

## **Funding and acknowledgments**

The project was supported by a research grant from Becton, Dickinson and Company, who had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

## Abstract

1 The main users of point of care testing devices placed outside the central laboratory are clinicians,  
2 predominantly nurses. Understanding the factors influencing sample accuracy is important to  
3 ensure appropriate clinical decision making. Previous studies focus on the analysis process,  
4 however, errors can also occur during the pre-analytical phase, linked to user knowledge, skills and  
5 other factors associated with the wider context of care.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 This study explored adult critical care nurses' views about point of care testing, the challenges they  
12 experience and their suggestions on how the pre-analytic phase might be improved. Using a  
13 qualitative design, four focus group discussions took place with 60 critical care nurses studying at  
14 two London based Universities between April and July 2019. Anonymized and verbatim-transcribed  
15 focus group data were uploaded into NVivo<sub>11</sub> and underwent a standard process of inductive  
16 thematic analysis.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Findings suggest that nurses' concerns focus on three key areas: Training and competence; Sample  
26 frequency and volume; and impacts on patients, relatives and staff. Critical care nurses view POCT  
27 as a necessary task, which aids timely patient management. However, the process can detract  
28 nurses from performing other care duties. Being able to draw less blood was identified as an  
29 important way to increase patient comfort and to reduce risks.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Collaborative working is key to ensure that improvements made to the pre-analytical process reflect  
38 users' needs. Ensuring best use of nurses' time by streamlining pre-analytical processes and  
39 ensuring equipment is readily available for use is important to ensure other clinical priorities can be  
40 achieved.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

## Keywords

46  
47 Point of care; nursing; qualitative; focus groups  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Introduction

1 Point of care testing (POCT) refers to laboratory testing that occurs close to the patient, enabling  
2 blood and other samples to be analyzed rapidly at the bedside (Shaw 2016). Since POCT devices  
3 are placed outside the central laboratory, the main users in a hospital setting are clinicians,  
4 predominantly nurses (Fitzgibbon et al., 2008). In critical care units (intensive care units (ICUs) and  
5 emergency departments (EDs)) nurses are frequent POCT users. One survey of critical care nurse  
6 consultants by Lamb et al. (1995) reported that, in 35% of the ICUs they studied, nurses exclusively  
7 performed POCT, whilst 32.5% used a combination of technicians and nurses.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 POCT can speed up clinical decision-making and optimize patient health outcomes in general areas  
17 (Fitzgibbon 2009; Shaw 2016) and in critical care (Giuliano & Grant, 2002). A literature review by  
18 Rooney & Schilling (2014) also found that POCT has the potential to improve the timely discharge  
19 of patients from the ED, expedite triage of urgent patients, and decrease delays to treatment  
20 initiation. Other studies have also linked POCT to improved turnaround times in critical care areas  
21 and a decrease in iatrogenic blood loss (Giuliano & Grant, 2002).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28  
29  
30 Whilst POCT can be invaluable in a time critical situation, there is the potential for inaccuracies,  
31 which subsequently impact clinical decision making (Fitzgibbon 2009). Most studies to date have  
32 investigated this issue from the perspective of the analyzer itself, both within and outside of  
33 critical care (Auvet et al., 2016; Shaw 2016). However, the pre-analytical phase is the most  
34 vulnerable part of the total testing process and errors that occur during this period can lead to  
35 problems further downstream (Lippi et al., 2017). The pre-analytic phase includes all activity  
36 related to obtaining, handling and delivering the sample to the analytical device. Errors during this  
37 phase may be attributed to user knowledge, skills and other factors associated with workload and  
38 the wider context of care (Gregory & Buckner, 2014; Auvet et al., 2016).  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 Gregory & Buckner (2014) point out the importance of nurses' proactive participation in  
50 developing POCT to ensure the technology is helpful, rather than a hindrance. The implementation  
51 of POCT offers the potential for laboratory staff and nurses to work together more closely with the  
52 shared goal of improving patient care delivery and outcomes (Fitzgibbon, 2009). However, despite  
53 acknowledgement that incorporating nurses' views and experiences helps ensure systems are  
54 accurate, reliable and user friendly (Giuliano & Grant, 2002), no previous research has explored  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

nurses' perspectives on the pre-analytical factors, which might influence the reliability and validity of POCT in a critical care setting.

The aim of this study was to explore adult nurses' views and experiences of POCT use in critical care (intensive care unit (ICU) and emergency departments (ED)). The objectives were to explore:

- What POCTs are commonly used
- What challenges nurses experience during POCT
- How the pre-analytic phase of POCT can be improved

## **Materials and Methods**

The study employed a qualitative design, enabling the generation of knowledge grounded in human experience (Sandelowski, 2004). Inclusion criteria were adult nurses working in ICU or ED and studying for a specialist qualification at one of two London based Universities (Box I). Following ethical approval (ETH1819-0094), professional colleagues were asked to circulate study information to their student cohorts via email and during classroom sessions. No incentives for participation were offered. Contact details of the chief investigator were available on the study information sheet along with details about how to take part.

### ***Box I: Inclusion & Exclusion criteria***

Data were collected between April and July 2019. Four audio-recorded focus group discussions, each with 8-20 people studying on the same module took place either in the classroom or another agreed location at the respective university. Lasting no more than one hour, an experienced qualitative researcher facilitated all discussions, which in agreement with the module leaders took place during one of the participants' study days. A topic guide, informed by a review of the literature aided data collection, focused around five areas: samples taken and training received; timing, rationale and process; errors and their management; impacts on nurses and the wider team; suggested improvements. After describing sample characteristics, anonymized and verbatim-transcribed focus group data were uploaded into NVivo11 and underwent a standard process of inductive thematic analysis as described by Braun & Clark (2006).

## **Findings**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Data analysis revealed three key themes: training and competence; sampling frequency and volume; impacts.

### ***Training and competence***

Whilst all participants had received some training, the frequency of this varied. Keeping up with competency requirements was viewed as problematic with a large turnover of nursing staff. Many participants described not receiving any refresher training and some had not been formally assessed as competent. One participant said, *"We have to do it online to be reassessed...If you fail you have to do the essential training again...We have a self-assessment, I don't think we do it every year though, every two years, for all medical devices"*.

Discussions highlighted that, whilst technical support is normally available, a significant amount of responsibility remains with the nurses. Participants explained that, *"All the calibration will be band 6/7 (senior nurses) but it's the techs who does all the training for the machines"*. They stressed the need for user friendly systems and for training to include the whole process including how and why results can be inaccurate: *"I think it's a good thing to be able to use the machine, but it will be a better thing for all nurses to understand what the ABGs are actually saying, because we are taught to use the machine but not everybody is taught how to read or interpret the results, which I think would be extremely valuable to the nurses' work"*.

### ***Sampling frequency and volume***

The frequency of sampling and the amount of blood taken was discussed in all focus groups. Although there was variation depending on the clinical condition of the patient, blood volumes taken could add up to a substantial amount as illustrated in a quote from one of the ED nurses: *"If it is just a repeat VBG [venous blood gas], you are talking a couple of mls...the other bottles are like 4mls, some 3mls, its normally about 3 or 4 bottles"*. In sicker patients, participants described frequent sampling, with significant volumes drawn for each sample: *"if they are really sick ...each time 1 or 2 mls and you might be doing that 12 times? That's quite a lot"*. This was particularly true where dead space volume had to be discarded, as explained by one person who said, *"if you are doing 12 blood gases and wasting 3 mls each time, you are wasting a lot of blood in one shift... If you are taking it from a central line, it can be 10 mls"*.

## **Impacts**

1 Participants recognized the value of POCT for speeding up clinical decision making and care  
2 delivery commenting that *"I think its really good because once you have got your gas [sic] you can*  
3 *start to see if the patient is stable or not and you can decide where to put them, its part of your*  
4 *initial assessment, if you are concerned...so we can escalate concerns...It speeds it up hugely"*.  
5  
6

7 However, they identified a range of unwanted impacts related to the pre-analytical period. These  
8 included iatrogenic anemia due to frequent sampling, with one participant saying, *"we were told*  
9 *that we lose a unit of two of red cells over a month for patients in ICU because we take samples*  
10 *very frequently"*. Despite this, few participants recognized the potential impact this had on the  
11 need for blood transfusion, highlighted by the following quote: *"I wouldn't say I've ever felt like*  
12 *I've had to transfuse somebody because I've done lots of blood gases"*. Participants also pointed  
13 out the associated infection control and environmental issues, with one saying, *"all that waste,*  
14 *some of it is biohazardness waste too, there is also an impact on the environment"*.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Participants wanted accurate results, which gave them clinical confidence and avoided delays to  
26 treatment, as highlighted by one participant who said, *"... its so important that I have to have that*  
27 *result"*. They were, however, concerned about potential delays, which could impact on clinical  
28 decision making and treatment. Calibration times for the blood gas machine was something that  
29 frequently frustrated nurses as illustrated by the following quote: *"We carry a smartphone...I can*  
30 *literally access any point in the world on google maps in about 9 seconds when I'm on the tube, yet*  
31 *for a gas machine...I just don't understand how I can find out what the weathers like in Nairobi on*  
32 *my phone yet a gas machine takes half a year to calibrate"*.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Participants also raised concerns related to the sampling process. For example, one person said,  
44 *"The sample, might then become haemolyzed and then you have to get a new one, so you are*  
45 *taking more blood and delaying the clinical decision making"*. Others described the impact of  
46 having to take repeated samples on the patient: *"then we would have to rebleed the patient...it*  
47 *depends how sick they are."* Comfort of the patient was a key concern, particularly within the ED,  
48 where more patients were awake and without an arterial line in situ: *"I don't like it, you have to*  
49 *keep going back and saying I'm really really sorry, you feel guilty for the fact that you are having to*  
50 *use them like a pin cushion. They are unwell enough as it is and then we have to keep poking them*  
51 *with a needle, I feel terrible doing that, I don't like doing it"*.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 The time taken for POCT also impacted other aspects of nursing care and the wider team.  
2 Participants pointed out that they frequently had to leave the bedside for significant periods. For  
3 example, one person said, *"If the gas machine doesn't work, you've got to go to another unit, You  
4 have to get another nurse to cover your side room, which means then that other nurse that you are  
5 working with is on their own in their bay... and also sometimes there is a queue in the other unit, so  
6 sometimes you can be away for like 10 minutes, even though you just want to run a gas, and that,  
7 for our unit anyway, that then impacts three nurses, which impacts three patients"*.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

16 This view was supported by others, who said, *"It affects other staff...my colleague next door, she is  
17 supposed to go on break in 10 minutes, I go to do a blood gas which take only 5 minutes, I go  
18 there, it's not working, I have to go to another department, she can't go to break, she can't do care  
19 for her own patient, and other people can't then have their break, it affects the whole  
20 team...Relatives can lose confidence in you if you are not there for them"*. Participants also  
21 highlighted that time away from the bedside undertaking POCT meant omissions in care provision  
22 for both the patient and their family, as highlighted by one participant who said, *"The caring  
23 aspect of nursing, it actually takes that element away...the pressure area care, the mouth care,  
24 getting them a cup of tea...You have less time with your patient. It's that, time away from the  
25 patient"*.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Participants wanted to be able to draw less blood as felt this would increase patient comfort,  
38 reduce iatrogenic anemia and unnecessary additional transfusions, reduce time required to  
39 process samples and reduce the risk of infection and other environmental hazards.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

## 45 **Discussion**

46 Our findings align with the limited literature available on this topic. Nurses do appear to be the  
47 most frequent POCT users in critical care, with the most common tests performed being arterial  
48 and venous blood gas, hemoglobin and electrolyte analysis. Our findings support that the amount  
49 of blood taken depends mainly on the type of test required and the decision of the bedside nurse,  
50 supporting nurses as one of the biggest influences on POCT.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Whilst findings from our study and those of others emphasize the value of POCT, they also  
2 highlight the potential for POCT to detract critical care nurses from performing other care duties  
3 (Lamb et al., 1995; Duffy et al., 2010; Gregory & Buckner, 2014; McNicol et al., 2018). Duffy et al.  
4 (2010) report that point of care (POC) documentation systems also distract nurses and negatively  
5 impact the nurse-patient relationship. The findings of McNicol et al. (2018) further support that  
6 patients notice this lack of engagement with the nurses when they are using POC information  
7 technology (IT) systems. Whilst POC documentation and IT have different purposes, there are  
8 obvious overlaps suggesting that these findings might also be true for nurses using POCT. Nurse  
9 distraction has the potential to lead to patient safety concerns, particularly in a critical care  
10 setting, where timely accurate decision making is essential to maintain patient safety.

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 Participants in our study expressed considerable frustration with some of the equipment and the  
20 technical support available to them; a frustration shared with other reports, for example in use of  
21 POC IT systems (McNicol et al., 2018). Training and ongoing assessment of competence is vital to  
22 avoid errors in the pre-analytic phase impacting on sample analysis. However, how to ensure  
23 nurses have the right knowledge and skill was identified as a particular concern from our study  
24 and has been highlighted in earlier work (for example, Miller & Miller, 2002). Nurses' focus is on  
25 patient care delivery, not quality control procedures. Ensuring that all nurses perform POCT in a  
26 consistent manner each time a test is carried out is a challenge (Fitzgibbon, 2009). Even where  
27 nurses performing POCT are well trained, measurement errors can occur due to the POCT device  
28 not being correctly maintained or calibrated, leading to erroneous results, which could have  
29 serious consequences for patients. A systematic review by Liikanen & Lehto (2013) suggests that  
30 distance learning can help achieve the requirements for training, however, this depends on  
31 nurses' motivation to complete e-learning and their ability to embed this into their busy working  
32 lives.

33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 Whilst most nurses view POCT as a necessary task, which helps with patient management, it can  
49 detract from performing other nursing care duties (Lamb et al., 1995; Gregory & Buckner, 2014).  
50 The nursing time associated with POCT, particularly when devices are not working and/or there is  
51 a need to travel to other areas to analyze samples not only has a potential impact on the accuracy  
52 of the results, but also on time available to deliver patient care. This is at a time when there is a  
53 significant nursing resource shortage. Within the United Kingdom (UK), NHS nursing vacancies are  
54 estimated to be almost 44,000 (12% of the nursing workforce) (Roache, 2020) and internationally  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 this issue is particularly significant in specialist areas such as ICU, perioperative care and  
2 emergency departments (Hayhurst et al., 2005; Khan et al., 2019). The more time spent on POCT  
3 means less time for providing fundamental aspects of nursing care, such as personal hygiene,  
4 medication administration and psychological support. The high turnover of staff also makes  
5 training more challenging.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Point of care coordinators have an important role in mitigating risks and optimizing the benefits of  
11 POCT (Fitzgibbon et al., 2009), however, much of the responsibility (particularly out of hours) still  
12 falls to the nursing staff. Our findings support the need for further collaborative working between  
13 nurses and laboratory staff, to ensure future practice models consider nurses' perspectives and  
14 reflect the whole process (including the pre analytical phase) to ensure patient safety (Miller &  
15 Miller, 2002).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **Strengths and weaknesses**

24 This is the first published study to report critical care nurses' views of the pre-analytical phase of  
25 POCT. Although small scale, the findings of this qualitative study have resonance with the very  
26 limited data available and identify important issues that need to be considered.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 **Conclusion**

34 This study explored adult critical care nurses' views and experiences of POCT. Findings suggest  
35 that nurses' concerns focus on three key areas: training and competence; sampling frequency and  
36 volume; impacts on patients, relatives and staff. Being able to draw less blood was identified as an  
37 important way to increase patient comfort and to reduce risks. Ensuring best use of nurses' time  
38 by streamlining pre-analytical processes and ensuring equipment is readily available for use is  
39 important to ensure other clinical priorities can be achieved.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

### 53 **References**

54 Auvet A, Espitalier F, Grammatico-Guillon L, et al. Preanalytical conditions of point-of-care testing  
55 in the intensive care unit are decisive for analysis reliability. *Ann Intensive Care*. 2016; 6:57. doi:  
56 10.1186/s13613-016-0152-6.  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*. 2006;  
2 3: 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.  
3

4  
5  
6 Duffy WJ, Kharasch MS, Du H. Point of care documentation impact on the nurse-patient  
7 interaction. *Nurs Admin Q*. 2010; 34 (1): E1–E10.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Fitzgibbon F, Meenan BJ, Brown A. et al. User perspective of cardiac marker point of care testing  
13 for hospital based chest pain diagnosis. *Point of Care*. 2008; 7(2): 47-53.  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 Fitzgibbon FJ, Meenan BJ, Huckle D, et al. Perspectives on the impact of point-of-care testing for  
19 cardiac markers on healthcare professional working relationships. 2009. Available at:  
20 <https://acutecaretesting.org/>. Accessed January 30<sup>th</sup> 2020.  
21  
22  
23

24  
25  
26 Giuliano KK, Grant ME. Blood analysis at the point of care: issues in application for use in critically  
27 ill patients. *AACN Clin Issues*. 2002; 13: 204-20.  
28  
29

30  
31  
32 Hayhurst A, Saylor C, Stuenkel D. Work environmental factors and retention of nurses. *Journal of*  
33 *Nursing Care Quality*. 2005: 20: 283–288.  
34  
35

36  
37  
38 Gregory D, Buckner M. Point-of-Care technology; Integration for improved delivery of care. *Crit*  
39 *Care Nurs Q*. 2014; 37: 268–272.  
40  
41

42  
43  
44 Khan N, Jackson D, Stayt L, et al. Factors influencing nurses' intentions to leave adult critical care  
45 settings. *Nurs Crit Care*. 2019; 24:24-32. doi: 10.1111/nicc.12348.  
46  
47

48  
49  
50 Lamb LS, Parrish RS, Goran SF, et al. Current nursing practice of point-of-care laboratory diagnostic  
51 testing in critical care units. *Am J Crit Care*. 1995; 4:429-34.  
52  
53

54  
55  
56 Liikanen E, Lehto L. Training of nurses in point-of-care testing: a systematic review of the  
57 literature. *J Clin Nurs*. 2013; 22: 2244-52. doi: 10.1111/jocn.12235.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Lippi G, Baird GS, Banfi G, et al. Improving quality in the preanalytical phase through innovation,  
2 on behalf of the European Federation for Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (EFLM)  
3 Working Group for Preanalytical Phase (WG-PRE). *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2017; 55:489-500. doi:  
4 10.1515/cclm-2017-0107.  
5  
6

7  
8 McNicol L, Hutchinson AF, Wood B, et al. An exploration of patients' experience of nurses' use of  
9 point-of-care information technology in acute care. *Patient Experience Journal*. 2018; 5: 11.  
10 <https://pxjournal.org/journal/vol5/iss1/11>.  
11  
12

13  
14  
15  
16 Miller KA, Miller N. Nursing & laboratory: working together to improve patient testing.  
17 *Point of Care*. 2002; 1: 32–34.  
18  
19

20  
21  
22 Roache M. Unprecedented pressure on the NHS as we head into 2020. GlobalComment.com.  
23 2020; <http://globalcomment.com/unprecedented-pressure-on-the-nhs-as-we-head-into-2020/>.  
24 Accessed January 30<sup>th</sup> 2020.  
25  
26

27  
28  
29 Rooney KD, Schilling UM. Point-of-care testing in the overcrowded emergency department – can it  
30 make a difference? *Critical Care*. 2014; 18: 692. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13054-014-0692-9>.  
31  
32

33  
34  
35 Sandelowski M. Using qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*. 2004; 14: 1366–1386.  
36 doi:10.1177/1049732304269672.  
37  
38

39  
40  
41 Shaw J. Practical challenges related to point of care testing. *Practical Laboratory Medicine*.  
42 2016; 4: 22-29.  
43  
44

45  
46  
47 **Box I: Inclusion & Exclusion criteria**  
48

Inclusion	Exclusion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Registered nurse (adult)</li><li>Working in an ICU or ED</li><li>Studying a specialist critical care module</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Nurses studying modules not run by XXX* or XXX* Universities</li></ul>

49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56 \*Names deleted for anonymity purposes  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Box I: Inclusion & Exclusion criteria**

<b>Inclusion</b>	<b>Exclusion</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Registered nurse (adult)</li><li>• Working in an ICU or ED</li><li>• Studying a specialist critical care module</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Nurses studying modules not run by XXX* or XXX* Universities</li></ul>

\*Names deleted for anonymity purposes