Research Article

International Journal of Clinical and Medical Case Reports

# Clinical Decision Making of Medical-Surgical Clinics and ICUs, Emergency Rooms

**Nikolaos B***

[2]Associate Professor, Department of Nursing, University of Patras, Greece

***Corresponding author**

Nick A. Bakalis, Associate Professor, Department of Nursing, University of Patras, Greece,
E-mail: nikosbakalis@upatras.gr

**Received Date:** August 06 2022
**Accepted Date:** August 08 2022
**Published Date:** September 07 2022

**Abstract**

Clinical navigation is a basic piece of nursing science and everyday clinical nursing practice.

**Points:** To explore and look at clinical choices made by medical attendants working in Health Centers, Emergency Departments (ERs), Medical and Surgical Clinics and Intensive Care Units (ICU).

**Methods:** Clinical dynamic cards (Q system) and a poll were created to research factors that impact clinical independent direction.

**Results:** Nurses working in Health Centers went with moderate clinical choices for dyspnea and fragmented clinical choices for CPR, while medical attendants working in ERs settled on great clinical choices for MI and moderate for dyspnea. Likewise, attendants working in Medical Clinics went with moderate clinical choices for all situations (CPR, MI, dyspnea, heaving). At last, medical caretakers working in Surgical Clinics settled on great clinical choices for dyspnea and moderate for CPR, while attendants working in ICU pursued great clinical choices for all situations.

**Ends:** Nurses working in ICU go with preferred clinical choices over attendants working in Health Centers, ERs, Medical and Surgical Clinics. This is conceivable because of the better staffing of the ICUs, the execution of nursing conventions, the serious level of independence they have and the seriousness of the patietns sickness they face consistently.

**Keywords:** Clinical decision making; Nurses; Greece

## Introduction

### Clinical Decisions

The day to day choices that medical caretakers make with respect to hospitalization and the utilization of restricted assets compel them to think and act in situations where there are neither unmistakable responses nor explicit strategies (Stillman, 2018) and frequently settling on a choice turns into a considerably more convoluted process (Papathanasiou, 2016). Successful clinical thinking abilities are a vital figure forestalling clinical blunders (Nibbelink and Brewer, 2018) . Nurture really should pursue sound clinical choices since they work on the nature of the patient's medical care, as it offers the best medical advantages in the best and OK manner (Marino, Andrews and Ward, 2020).

Independent direction is viewed as a fundamental part of the nursing job. Models of training are basically dynamic models and consequently inseparable from acknowledged meanings of expert action (Taner, 2006). Restricting (2008) characterized decision making as a cycle that attendants use to assemble data about patients, assess it and make decisions that outcome in the arrangement of nursing care. Notwithstanding the broad estimation of direction, most creators have characterized the dynamic interaction.

A few creators utilize the expressions critical thinking, decisive reasoning, clinical thinking, clinical judgment and decision making reciprocally (Román-Cereto et al 2018, Cui et al 2018), while others separate between navigation, clinical thinking and critical thinking (Johansen and O'Brien 2015, Finkelman, 2001). Khamseh et al (2019) states that critical thinking includes a union of new data got from existing information to distinguish answers for issue circumstances. Decisive reasoning is characterized by Sommers (2018) as a cycle and mental expertise that medical caretakers apply to distinguish and characterize issues as well as to arrive at resolutions. In this way, decisive reasoning is a fundamental piece of navigation (Cui et al (2018) however not inseparable from critical thinking. Rababa and Al-Rawashdeh (2021) bring up that decisive reasoning may not close answers for issues, yet a more prominent comprehension of the actual issue and a need to endure uncertainty. It appears to be that independent direction isn't inseparable from critical thinking yet rather it is a device to tackle issues.

Moreover, as per Merisier et al (2018) clinical thinking is the cycle by which medical caretakers gather signals, process data, come to a comprehension of a patient's concern, plan and carry out mediations, assess results, and consider the interaction. Clinical thinking contrasts from navigation, in that it specifically centers around the reasoning methodologies used to go with a judgment or choice and take care of issues

(Johansen and O'Brien 2015). Then again, Al Sabei and Lasater (2016) bring up that clinical judgment is an understanding or determination about a patient's necessities, concerns, or medical conditions as well as to settle on when to take (or not take) activity, change standard methodologies and make do as considered significant as per the patient's reaction. Manetti (2019) uncovered that clinical judgment is a questionable term interchangeable to direction and results from decisive reasoning and clinical thinking.

The fields of mental brain research and the board science have delivered various and frequently clashing speculations of direction. From an expressed normal reason to make sense of and foresee the cycles that oversee human choices, these hypotheses make different suspicions about the idea of information and age of data. There are two essential models of nursing direction: a) the data handling model, in which choices are made by conventions and calculations and b) the natural humanist model, where choices are made by experience and information (Banning, 2007).

**Impacting Factors of Clinical Decision Making**

Research has shown that medical attendants' clinical choices are mostly impacted by long stretches of involvement (Kydonaki et al 2016, Nibblelink and Brewer 2018), decisive reasoning (Ludin, 2018) and cooperation with associates (Despins, 2017). Different variables that additionally impact attendants' clinical navigation are association factors (ten Ham et al, 2017), unit culture (Braaten, 2015), the patient's psychosomatic condition, nursing specialization programs (Aktaş and Karabulut, 2016), as well as conventions (Tonnelier et al, 2005) and reflection (Razieh, Somayeh and Fariba, 2018).

**Nursing Science in Greece**

Nursing in Greece has its own qualities. In particular, nursing schooling is essential for the degree of advanced education (the term of review is four years). Medical attendants' expert privileges in Greece are characterized by regulations (Presidential Law, 1989). The lawful system in Greece restricts medical caretakers' independence and in this manner ruins pursuing clinical choices (Bakalis, Bowman and Porock, 2003). There is an earnest need to lay out new expert freedoms to grow the job of Greek attendants.

With respect to essential medical services, in spite of the fact that Health Centers in Greece fundamentally offer essential consideration administrations, they are described as underfunded and understaffed. It is for the most part acknowledged that in Greece structures that arrangement with illness, for example, medical clinics have more noteworthy subsidizing than essential consideration which manages sickness anticipation.

Trauma center congestion is a continuous peculiarity particularly lately because of the insufficiency of essential consideration administrations, absence of coordinated ERs as per worldwide norms and the increment patient confirmation because of the financial emergency (from private to public) (Lydakis et al, 2014). In the Medical and Surgical Clinics the attendant assume a significant part (Douw et al 2018, Hallet et al 2016). In spite of every centers qualities, they are described by nurture understaffing (because of the monetary emergency) and need execution of nursing conventions, pursuing clinical choices troublesome (Lourantaki and Katsaliaki, 2017). At last, in an European overview the least medical caretaker to-patient proportions have been accounted for in Greek ICUs (Papathanassoglou et al., 2012). Medical caretakers in ICUs are accomplished in the field of concentrated care, apply nursing conventions, while simultaneously exhibit the most noteworthy pace of clinical dynamic in this field (Evangelou and Hatzibalassi, 2016).

Since there is no comparative exploration directed in Greece, the reason for the review was to research and look at clinical choices made by attendants working in Health Centers, Emergency Departments (ERs), Medical and Surgical Clinics and Intensive Care Units (ICUs).

**Materials and Methods**

Clinical Decision-Making Cards (CDM Cards) were created, which depended on the Q philosophy to gauge the nature of attendants clinical independent direction. At first, four crises circumstances were chosen, two of which have more clinical treatment (Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation, Acute Myocardial Infarction), while the other two need seriously nursing treatment (Dyspnea, Vomiting). This way the scientists had the option to assess medical attendants' clinical choices in two distinct kinds of cases. Every situation included six different series and were scored along these lines to Williamson framework (Williamson, 1965). Things were weighted as follows, adjusted from Williamson (1965): thing crucial for care for this patient (+2), thing works with care yet not fundamental (+1), thing neither advances nor hinders care (0), thing superfluous and causes uneasiness (- 1), thing imperils care (- 2). Nonetheless, the scoring framework was reworded, particularly the last score (unseemly consideration rather than risks care), to work with the point of the review.

There were no set in stone responses. The principal objective was to gauge the independence that attendants have in every situation. Medical attendants could pick just a single card in each column. In all series, there was a choice "Refer to the specialist as" card. The "Refer to the specialist as" card was the "improper" clinical choice with a score of - 2 in all series (latent job). Assuming that the medical caretakers picked the "Refer to the Doctor as" card in two back to back lines then the situation would be fruitless. A comparable strategy was utilized by Bakalis, Bowman and Porock (2003) to examine and gauge the nature of medical caretakers' clinical choices.

For the development of the CPR situation, the CPR Protocol inside the Hospital of the European Resuscitation Council (Soar et al, 2015) was utilized, while for the MI situation, the MI Management Protocol of the European Resuscitation Council (Nikolaou et al, 2015) was utilized. The CPR situation depended on the means for treating a grown-up understanding who has endured coronary failure. As to last two situations (dyspnea

and heaving) on the grounds that no conventions were found during the writing survey, the latest techniques used to build these situations. All the more explicitly, data on dyspnea was utilized by Thomas and von Gunten (2002), Campbell (2017) and Papi et al (2018), while on heaving data was utilized by Harbord and Pomfret (2013), Keeley (2015) and Pleuvry (2015).

Then, a poll was created to concentrate on the elements impacting medical caretakers' clinical dynamic which was partitioned into two sections. The initial segment contained five inquiries concerning factors impacting clinical independent direction and the subsequent part comprised of eleven inquiries with respect to the examples segment data.

Both the cards and the survey were given to a group of specialists (one Nursing teacher work in clinical choices and two different medical caretakers with numerous long periods of involvement with both the clinical region and the local area). Subsequent to concentrating on the situations, the choices and the poll, they presented their perspectives. After conversation the contents and the poll took their last structure. Cronbach's Alpha dependability record of the poll was equivalent to 0.783.

**Test**

Accommodation examining was utilized. A sum of 87 medical caretakers working in nine general Health Centers and five public emergency clinics in Athens, Greece took part. During the examining system, the scientists kept up with every one of the standards of exploration morals.

**Method**

At first the scientists sent a composed solicitation to the Regional Health Administration and the medical clinics morals board to get consent to lead the review. Whenever consent was conceded (endorsement number: 113/14-3-2019, Δαδδ/14488/8-3-2019, 9406/26-3-2019, 27/28-2-2019, 7/13-3-2019, 6/26-2-2019) the scientists started gathering the information. Medical attendants were drawn nearer during working hours and educated about the reason regarding the review. The medical caretakers separately took part in the examination in a space that guaranteed security and without obstruction. At the point when the member finished every one of the four situations, the poll researching the variables affecting clinical navigation were additionally finished.

**Information Analysis**

Information examination was performed utilizing three techniques:

1) the typical score,

2) the nature of clinical choices was ordered by the score got in every situation (least score - 9, most extreme +12). Four classifications were built: a) insufficient (score - 9 to - 0.01), b) normal (0 to 4), c) great (4.01 to 8), d) excellent (8.01 to 12),

3) the estimation of the level of fruition of every situation per work environment.

**Results**

**Test Demographic Infromation**

Most of the example were ladies (87.4%), matured from 25 to 58 years (x = 39.1 years). A large portion of the example didn't have a postgraduate certification (66.7%) while 50.6% of the example had a yearly family pay between € 10,001 to € 20,000. At long last, 19.5% of the example worked in Health Centers, 18.4% in ERs, 20.7% in Medical Clinic, 18.4% in Surgical Clinic and 23% in ICUs, while theis work experince ran between a half year to 33 years (x = 14.04 years).

**Situation 1 Results: CPR**

In Scenario 1 (CPR) the most elevated score acquired was by medical caretakers working in ICU (x = + 4.50), the second by attendants working in ERs (x = + 3.75), medical attendants working in Surgical Clinics had the third most noteworthy score (x = + 3.38) while attendants working in Health Centers (normal worth x = - 0.35) had the least score (Table 1).

In Scenario 1 (CPR) most of attendants working in Health Centers settled on lacking clinical choices, attendants in ERs and Medical facilities pursued deficient and normal clinical choices, while medical caretakers in Surgical Clinics got normal to great clinical choices. At last, most of medical caretakers working in the ICU settled on great to awesome clinical choices.

**Situation 2 Results: MI**

With respect to 2 (MI) the most noteworthy score (x = + 4.95) was gathered by medical caretakers working in ICUs, attendants working in ERs got the second most noteworthy score (x = + 4.81) and medical caretakers working in Surgical Clinics obtanined the third most elevated score (x = +3,31). At last, the most reduced score was acquired by attendants working in Health Centers (x = - 0.47) and the second least score (esteem x = + 0.83) was achived by medical caretakers working in Medical Clinics (Table 2).

In Scenario 2 (MI) most of attendants working in Health Centers, Medical and Surgery facilities pursued deficient and normal clinical choices, while the attendants in ERs and ICUs went with great and awesome clinical choices.

**Situation 3 Results: Shortness of breath**

In Scenario 3 (Dyspnea) the most elevated score was acquired by the medical caretakers working in ICU (x = + 4.75), the second most noteworthy score was gathered by the attendants working in Surgical Clinics (x = + 4.31) and the third most noteworthy score (x = + 3.63) was accomplished by medical attendants working in ERs (Table 3).

In Scenario 3 (Dyspnea), most of attendants working in Health Centers and Medical facilities pursued deficient and normal clinical choices, while medical caretakers in ERs, Surgical centers and ICUs went with great clinical choices.

**Situation 4 Results: Vomiting**

In Scenario 4 (Vomiting) the most noteworthy score (x = + 4.65) was gathered by medical caretakers working in ICU, attendants working in ERs demostrated the second most elevated score (x = + 3.69) and the third most noteworthy score (x = + 3.44) was accomplished by medical attendants working in Surgical Clinics (Table 4).

In Scenario 4 (Vomiting) most of attendants working in Health Centers settled on deficient clinical choices, while attendants in ERs, Medical Clinics, Surgical Clinics and ICUs went with normal and great choices (Table 5).

In all work environments, most attendants effectively finished the situations anyway in medical attendants that worked in Medical Clinics showed the least fulfillment rate (dyspnea situation). The most noteworthy rates of fruitful culmination were gathered by medical attendants who worked in the ERs (CPR), Surgical Clinics (MI) while for the ICUs with respect to the situations dyspnea and spewing.

**Factors Affecting Clinical Decision Making**

Most of the attendants who worked in the ERs, Medical Clinics, Surgical Clinics and ICUs announced that there nursing conventions in their workplaice while attendants working in Health Centers guaranteed they were none. Most of medical caretakers working in all designs detailed that they have independence in their working environment (from not the slightest bit to like clockwork) (Table 6).

Most of attendants who worked in the Health Centers, ERs, Surgical Clinics and ICUs addressed adversely, while the attendants in the Medical Clinics were separated (Table 7).

Most of attendants working in Health Centers, Medical Clinics, Surgical Clinics and ICUs addressed adversely, while most of medical attendants working in ERs addressed decidedly.

The Kruskal-Wallis test uncovered that medical attendants working in ICUs go with the best clinical choices in the analyzed situations ($p<0.05$). There is no connection concerning measurable importance ($p> 0.05$) in regards to the relationship of every situation score with segment information (e.g age, clinical experience).

**Conversation**

The current investigation discovered that attendants pursue better choices in situations that include additional nursing choices and activities (windedness and retching) than in situations with additional clinical choices and systems (CPR and MI). Comparable outcomes were accounted for by Bakalis, Bowman and Porock (2003).

Likewise, medical attendants who worked in Health Centers, in spite of the fact that they effectively finished every one of the concentrated on situations, settled on normal clinical choices for dyspnea and deficient clinical choices in CPR, MI and spewing. It appears to be that the misjudged job of the medical caretaker in Health Centers, are the primary explanations behind the normal nature of clinical nursing choices.

With respect to working in ERs, they pursued great clinical choices for MI, most likely on the grounds that this is a typical event in ERs, while going against the norm they settled on normal clinical choices for CPR, dyspnea and heaving, which goes against the way that Nurses working in ERs are pretty much as independent as medical caretakers working in ICUs regarding crisis the board (Al-Adwan, Stanford and Hamner 2017, Traub, Temkit and Saghafian, 2017, Karra et al 2014).

With respect to the attendants working in Medical Clinics and Surgical Clinics, they settled on normal clinical choices for CPR, MI, dyspnea and retching, predominantly because of absence of nursing conventions and muddled obligations. At long last, medical caretakers working in ICUs pursued great and awesome clinical choices for CPR, MI, dyspnea and retching because of the seriousness of the episodes they have and the crises that frequently happen inside this setting.

**Impediments**

In the current review the example was little despite the fact that it was taken from the biggest wellbeing locale in Greece. Also, because of little example size speculations ought to be made with alert. Additionally, the exploration zeroed in just on four situations connected with nursing practice, as well as the recurrence of occurrences that happened in the concentrated on working environments contrasted essentially.

**Ends**

The current review showed that attendants effectively finished all situations. Concerning the attendants working in Health Centers they settle on bad quality clinical choices, while medical caretakers in ICUs are pursued better clinical choices. Also, attendants working in ERs, clinical and careful facilities settle on normal to great clinical choices. The clinical setting where medical caretakers work, appears to assume a significant part in the nature of clinical choices.

**Future Recommendations**

Medical caretakers' clinical choices essentially decide the patient's anticipation and result, particularly in crisis circumstances. It is subsequently critical to give rules and conventions in Greece, to further develop medical caretakers clinical choices. It is actually quite significant that CPR abilities should be refreshed regularly (6 to ten months) for medical attendants to include effectively in the administration of heart failure (Makinen et al 2009, Mpotos et al 2015).

Furthermore, as to nursing strengths, Community Nursing,

Emergency Nursing and Intensive Care Nursing ought to be added. Moreover, regulation is the most significant and deciding variable in nursing clinical navigation. Updating medical attendants' expert rights is accordingly basic. At last, proceeding with schooling should be dynamic, in each wellbeing area, while factors that impact Greek medical caretakers' clinical dynamic need further examination, to upgrade future nursing care and medical attendants clinical choices.

**References**

1. Aktaş YY, Karabulut, N. A Survey on Turkish nursing students' perception of clinical learning environment and its association with academic motivation and clinical decision making. Nurse Education Today. 2016; 36: 124-8.

2. Al-Adwan O, Stanford J, Hamner M. Examining the Utilization of Medical Scribes in a Hospital Emergency Department Environment. Procedia Computer Science. 2017; 118: 34-47.

3. Al Sabei SD, Lasater K. Simulation debriefing for clinical judgment development: A concept analysis. Nurse Education Today. 2016; 45: 42-7.

4. Bakalis N, Bowman GS, Porock D. Decision making in Greek and English registered nurses in coronary care units. Int J Nurs Stud. 2003; 40 (7): 749 - 760.

5. Banning M. A review of clinical decision making: models and current research. Journal of Clinical Nursing. 2008; 17: 187-195.

6. Braaten JS. Hospital system barriers to rapid response team activation: A cognitive work analysis. American Journal of Nursing. 2015; 115(2): 22-33.

7. Campbell ML. Dyspnea. Critical Care Nursing Clinics of North America. 2017; 29: 461-70.

8. Cuia C, Lia Y, Gengb D, Zhanga H, Jinc C. The effectiveness of evidence-based nursing on development of nursing students' critical thinking: A meta-analysis. Nurse Education Today. 2018; 65: 46-53.

9. Despins LA. Factors influencing when intensive care unit nurses go to the bedside to investigate patient related alarms: A descriptive qualitative study. Intensive and Critical Care Nursing. 2017; 43: 101-107.

10. Douw G, Huisman-de Waal G, van Zanten ARH, van der Hoeven JG. Schoonhoven, L. Surgical ward nurses' responses to worry: An observational descriptive study. International Journal of Nursing Studies. 2018; 85: 90-5.

11. Evangelou X, Hatzibalassi M. Oral Health Hygiene in Patients Under Mechanical Ventilation: Knowledge Attitudes and Practices of Intensive Care Nurses. Nursing. 2016; 55: 41-51.

12. Finkelman A. Problem-solving, decision making and critical thinking: how do they mix and why bother? Home care provider. 2001; 6(6): 194-198.

13. Johansen ML, O'Brien JL. Decision Making in Nursing Practice: A Concept Analysis. Nurs Forum. 2016; 51(1): 40-48.

14. Hallet J, Wallace D, El-Sedfy A, Ahmed N, Smith AJ, Nathens AB, Conn LG, Coburn NG. Defining Communication Improvement Needs in General Surgery: An Analysis of Pages, Communications, Patterns, and Content. Journal of Surgical Education. 2016; 73: 959-967.

15. Harbord M, Pomfret S. Nausea and vomiting. Medicine. 2013; 41: 87-91.

16. Karra V, Papathanassoglou ED, Lemonidou C, Sourtzi P, Giannakopoulou M. Exploration and classification of intensive care nurses' clinical decisions: a Greek perspective. Nursing in Critical Care. 2014; 19: 87-97.

17. Keeley PW. Nausea and vomiting. Medicine. 2015; 43: 709-711.

18. Khamseh F, Parandeh A, Hajiamini Z, Tadrissi SD, Najjar M. Effectiveness of applying problem-solving training on depression in Iranian pregnant women: Randomized clinical trial. J Educ Health Promot. 2019; 8:87.

19. Kydonaki K, Huby G, Tocher J, Aitken LM. Understanding nurses' decision-making when managing weaning from mechanical ventilation: a study of novice and experienced critical care nurses in Scotland and Greece. Journal of Clinical Nursing. 2016; 25: 434-444.

20. Lourantaki I, Katsaliaki K. The global expansion of the professional role of nurses. Hellenic Medicine Archives. 2017; 34: 303-320.

21. Ludin SM. Does good critical thinking equal effective decision-making among critical care nurses? A cross-sectional survey. Intensive and Critical Care Nursing. 2018; 44: 1-10.

22. Lydakis Ch, Patramanis I, Lavrentaki K, Karavitaki

M, Neofotistos G. Overcrowding in emergency departments: The role of the "Low Risk Disaster Management Clinic". Hellenic Medicine Archives. 2014; 31: 336-41.

23. Mäkinena M, Niemi-Murolaa L, Kaila L, Castrénc M. Nurses' attitudes towards resuscitation and national resuscitation guidelines—Nurses hesitate to start CPR-D. Resuscitation. 2009; 80: 1399–1404.

24. Manetti W. Sound clinical judgment in nursing: A concept analysis. Nurs Forum. 2019; 54(1):102-110.

25. Marino MA, Andrews K, Ward J. Clinical Decision Making at the bedside. Nursing Clinics of North America. 2020; 55(1): 29-37.

26. Merisier S, Larue C, Boyer L. How does questioning influence nursing students' clinical reasoning in problem-based learning? A scoping review. Nurse Education Today. 2018; 65: 108-15.

27. Mpotos N, Decaluwe K, Van Belleghem V, Cleymans N, Raemaekers J, Derese A, et al. Automated testing combined with automated retraining to improve CPR skill level in emergency nurses. Nurse Education Today. 2015; 15: 212-217.

28. Nibbelink CW, Brewer BB. Decision making in nursing practice: an integrative literature review. Journal of Clinical Nursing. 2018; 27: 917-928.

29. Nikolaou NI, Arntz HR, Bellou A, Beygui F, Bossaert LL, Cariou A. European Resuscitation Council Guidelines for Resuscitation 2015 Section 8. Initial management of acute coronary syndromes. Resuscitation. 2015; 95: 264-77.

30. Papathanasiou J. Critical thinking in nursing practice: current for 2016 as never before. Hellenic Journal of Nursing Science. 2016; 9: 3-7.

31. Papathanassoglou ED, Karanikola MN, Kalafati M, Giannakopoulou M, Lemonidou C, Albarran JW. Professional autonomy, collaboration with physicians, and moral distress among European intensive care nurses. American Journal of Critical Care. 2012; 21: e41-52.

32. Papi A, Brightling C, Pedersen SE, Reddel HK. Asthma. The Lancet. 2018; 391: 783-800.

33. Pleuvry BJ. Physiology and pharmacology of nausea and vomiting. Anaesthesia & Intensive Care Medicine. 2015; 16: 462-6.

34. Presidential Law, 351/1989. Determination of Professional rights of the graduates from the departments a) Nursing, b) Midwifery, c) Health Visitors of the School of Health and Welfare Professions and d) Department of Public Health, School of Management and Economics (Law 159 / A / 14-6-1989).

35. Rababa M, Al-Rawashdeh S. Critical care nurses' critical thinking and decision making related to pain management. Intensive & Critical Care Nursing. 2021; 63: 10300.

36. Razieh S, Somayeh G, Fariba H. Effects of reflection on clinical decision-making of intensive care unit nurses. Nurse Education Today. 2018; 66: 10-14.

37. Román-Cereto M, García-Mayor S, Kaknani-Uttumchandani S, García-Gámez M, León-Campos A, Fernández-Ordóñez E, et al. Cultural adaptation and validation of the Lasater Clinical Judgment Rubric in nursing students in Spain. Nurse Education Today. 2018; 64: 71-78.

38. Soar J, Nolan JP, Böttiger BW, Perkins GD, Lott C, Carli P, et al. European Resuscitation Council Guidelines for Resuscitation 2015 Section 3. Adult advanced life support. Resuscitation. 2015; 95: 100-47.

39. Sommers C. Measurement of critical thinking, clinical reasoning, and clinical judgment in culturally diverse nursing students – A literature review. Nurse Education in Practice. 2018; 30: 91-100.

40. Stillman RC. Clinical Decision Support Tools Improving Cancer Care. Seminars in Oncology Nursing. 2018; 34: 158-67.

41. Taner CA. Thinking Like a Nurse: A Research-Based Model of Clinical Judgment in Nursing. Journal of Nursing Education. 2006; 45(6): 204-11.

42. ten Ham W, Ricks EJ, van Rooyen D, Jordan PJ. An Integrative Literature Review of the Factors That Contribute to Professional Nurses and Midwives Making Sound Clinical Decisions. International Journal of Nursing Knowledge. 2015; 28 (1): 19-29.

43. Thomas JR, von Gunten CF. Clinical management of dyspnoea. The Lancet Oncology. 2002; 3: 223-8.

44. Tonnelier JM, Prat G, LeGal G, Gut-Gobert C, Renault A, Boles JM, LHer E. Impact of a nurses' protocol-directed weaning procedure on outcomes in patients undergoing mechanical ventilation for longer than 48 hours: a prospective cohort study with a matched historical control group. Critical Care. 2005; 9: R83-9.

45. Traub SJ, Temkit M, Saghafian S. Emergency Department Holding Orders. The Journal of Emergency Medicine. 2017; 52: 885-93.

46. Williamson JW. Assessing clinical judgment. Journal of Medical Evaluation. 1965; 40: 180-187.