

# CRITICAL CARE CONGRESS

FEBRUARY 23-25, 2025 | ORLANDO, FLORIDA



2025 Critical Care Congress - Abstract and Case Report Submission Confirmation

2025 Critical Care Congress Submission Site: SCCM 2025

Abstracts/Case Report Scorecard

You can access your Submission at any time by [clicking here](#).

## Submission Format

Abstract Submission

## Submission Category:

Epidemiology - Outcomes

## Submission Status:

Complete

## Submission ID:

1894063

## Submission Title:

***Differences in Documentation Practices Across the Intensive Care Units in US – A Cluster Analysis***

## Author(s)

---

1. [Blessing Oladokun, MS](#) (Role: First Author)
2. [Vinai Modem, MBBS \(he/him/his\)](#) (Role: Co-Author)
3. [Catherine Gao, MD](#) (Role: Co-Author)
4. [Mannat V. Jain](#) (Role: Co-Author)
5. [Andrew Smith, MD, MSCI, MMHC](#) (Role: Co-Author)
6. [Nivedita Mankotia, MD](#) (Role: Co-Author)

## Abstract Content

---

### INTRODUCTION

Documentation in electronic health records facilitates communication between healthcare professionals. Previous studies have shown an association between documentation practices and patient outcomes. In this study, we leveraged SCCM Datathon resources to explore the variations in documentation among patients with differing patient-level and hospital-level features.

## METHODS

Patients  $\geq 18$  years were included in the study. The eICU-Collaborative Research Database was queried to identify eligible patients and de-identified data including patient demographics (age, gender and race-ethnicity), severity of illness, ICU type and hospital characteristics were extracted. We used frequency of nursing documentation of Physical Exam (PE count) as a surrogate marker for documentation practices. Physical exam was divided into 10 paths based on the body system (PE path). Hospital characteristics included type (academic or non-academic), size and region (Midwest, West, Northeast and South). Cluster analysis was performed based on PE count and path, using Kmeans. Clusters were compared with respect to patient-level, ICU-level and hospital-level characteristics as well as ICU mortality. Data munging was performed in Google BigQuery and analyzed using Python. GPT-4 was used for code and writing assistance.

## RESULTS

A total of 146,031 distinct ICU stays were analyzed. Mean ( $\pm$  SD) age of the cohort was 63 ( $\pm$  17), with male (54%) and Caucasian (77%) preponderance. Most of the patients were from non-teaching hospitals (73%), Med-Surg ICUs (55%) and Midwest region (37%). Kmeans clustering divided the cohort into 5 clusters. Clusters differed significantly with respect to region, patient demographics and hospital characteristics. Furthermore, ICU mortality varied between clusters, with high mortality in clusters 3 & 4 (11.6% & 11.5%), the low mortality in cluster 2 (5%). The multivariate logistic regression continued to show significant association between clusters and ICU mortality after adjusting for other covariates.

## CONCLUSIONS

In this large multi-center cohort study, we found 5 distinct clusters based on PE count and path. Significant differences were noted between clusters with respect patient-level and hospital-level characteristics with potential impact on ICU outcomes.

## Categories

---

1. **General Classification**

Clinical

2. **Patient Type**

Adult

3. **Category**

Epidemiology - Outcomes

4. **Category Alternate 1**

5. **Category Alternate 2**

6. **Keywords**

epidemiology/outcomes

## Ethics and AI Agreement

---

1. **In submitting this abstract/case report, I am affirming that the submission pertains to work done by me, as the submitting author, and my co-author colleagues; and that it was done according to generally accepted scientific research principles.**

I agree

2. **In submitting this abstract/case report, should artificial intelligence be used for content creation, I am affirming its use will be reported in the Methods section of the submission. Concealing the use of artificial intelligence in content creation violates scientific integrity and is regarded as scientific misconduct; disclosure is always required. Authors of a submission collectively assume all responsibility for artificial intelligence created content and of its verification. Failure to verify the creation of artificial intelligence created content before submission is scientific misconduct.**

I agree

## Program Director Information Form

---

1. **Is the First Author in a training program as an SCCM Sponsored Trainee member?**

No

2. **Program Director Name**
3. **Program Type**
4. **Program Institution**
5. **Program Director Email Address**

## Congress Scholarships

---

1. **Do you meet these criteria?**
  - Be an SCCM member**
  - Be a member of the section to which the applicant is applying**
  - Attending the 2025 Critical Care Congress**
  - Be the first and presenting author of an accepted abstract**
  - Not be a section leader**

Yes

2. **Select the section for which you are a member:**
3. **Select the section for which you are a member:**

4. **Select the section for which you are a member:**

## Abstract Award Applications

---

1. **SCCM In-Training Award**
2. **SCCM Early Stage Researcher Award**
3. **Clinical Pharmacist and Pharmacology: Patient Safety Early Stage Researcher Award**
4. **Clinical Pharmacist and Pharmacology: Innovations in Patient and Medication Safety Award**
5. **Hector R. Wong Award for Precision Medicine in Sepsis**

Don't forget, the submission process closes Thursday, August 1, 2024 at noon Central Time!  
No changes to an abstract or case report will be accepted after this date.

---

### **Customer Service**

Email: [Support@sccm.org](mailto:Support@sccm.org)

Phone: (847) 827-6888