ERASE Model. Structured debriefing model.

Modelo ERASE. Modelo de debriefing estructurado.

Marcos Javier CUERVA [1,2,3], Marta CORTÉS [2,3]

[1] Faculty of Medicine. Autonomous University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain.
[2] Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, La Paz University Hospital, Madrid, Spain.
[3] SIM-OBs, Working Group on Simulation in Obstetric Emergency Medicine, Madrid, Spain.

* Correspondence: marcos.cuerva@uam.es, ORCID: 0000-0002-8013-4732

Abstract: The ERASE model is presented . This is a structured debriefing model developed in Spanish to facilitate its implementation by Spanish-speaking instructors. It integrates key elements of established models such as PEARLS, 3D, iTRUST, and GAS, organizing the post-simulation analysis into five phases: Emotions, Summary, Actions, Suggestions, and Lessons Learned. Each stage corresponds functionally to phases of previous models, promoting emotional reflection, critical analysis, and applied synthesis. Its progressive and operational structure consolidates learning and fosters clinical improvement.

Keywords: Debriefing, simulation, structured debriefing, model, medical education.

Resumen: Se presenta el modelo ERASE. Se trata de un modelo estructurado de debriefing, desarrollado en castellano para facilitar su implementación por instructores hispanohablantes. Integra elementos clave de modelos consolidados como PEARLS, 3D, iTRUST y GAS, organizando el análisis post-simulación en cinco fases: Emociones, Resumen, Acciones, Sugerencias y Enseñanzas. Cada etapa guarda correspondencia funcional con fases de los modelos previos, promoviendo la reflexión emocional, el análisis crítico y la síntesis aplicada. Su estructura progresiva y operativa permite consolidar aprendizajes y fomentar la mejora clínica.

Palabras clave: Debriefing, simulación, debriefing estructurado, modelo, educación médica.

Brief Comment.

Structured debriefing is considered the cornerstone of clinical simulation learning (1-2). Following a simulated experience, guided reflective discussion allows participants to analyze their actions, modify their mental models, and consolidate new knowledge for future practice (3-4).

There are several models such as PEARLS (5), 3D (6), iTRUST (7), or GAS (2), to ensure that the debriefing is carried out in an orderly and effective manner. They all share pedagogical elements and are the basis for the development of the ERASE model, which we use in the Sim-Obs simulation group (Table 1).

Our model was created in Spanish, making it easy for Spanish speakers to implement. It can also be translated into English without changing the acronym. ERASE stands for: Emotions, Recap, Actions, Suggestions, and Endpoints.

The model is primarily designed for high-fidelity clinical simulations, defined as realistic, complex, and interactive experiences (8), although it can also be adapted to virtual or hybrid

simulation contexts, provided that the necessary contextual adjustments are made in the debriefing process. Each phase of the model has a balanced duration, with a recommendation of between 3 and 10 minutes per phase, depending on the complexity of the case, the experience of the group, and time availability. This results in a total debriefing duration of between 15 and 50 minutes. For effective implementation, it is recommended that facilitators have basic training in communication skills, emotional management, and educational leadership, as well as specific training to promote equitable participation through strategies such as targeted question distribution, round-robin response, and active validation of less frequent interventions.

Table 1. Phases of the ERASE model and their correspondences in the other models.

ERASE	PEARLS	GAS	3D	iTRUST
Emotions	Reactions	-	Defusing	Reactions
Summary	Description	Gather	-	Understanding
Actions	Analysis	Analyze	Discovering	Understanding
Suggestions	Application/ Summary	-	Deepening	Solutions
Teachings	Application/ Summary	Summarize	Deepening	Take-home message

Considering the cultural variations unique to the Spanish-speaking world, the model has proven to be sufficiently flexible and adaptable, having been successfully implemented by our team in diverse contexts, including participants from Spain, Cuba, Paraguay, Peru, Ecuador, Mexico, and Venezuela.

The "Emotions" phase corresponds to "Reactions" in the PEARLS and iTRUST models, and to "Defusing" in the 3D model (5–7). All of these frameworks recognize the need to manage immediate emotional responses following the simulation as a preliminary step for participants to access effective cognitive analysis. This emotional decompression is key to creating a safe and open learning environment.

"Summary" is equivalent to "Description" in PEARLS, "Gather" in GAS, and the initial part of "Understanding" in iTRUST (2, 5, 7). Its objective is to reconstruct the essential facts of the scenario in a shared way, generating a collective account that serves as a basis for subsequent analysis. This step avoids narrative distortions and aligns participants on what happened, when, and how, creating a common starting point for critical reflection.

"Actions" is the analytical core of the ERASE model, aligned with "Analysis" in PEARLS, "Analyze" in GAS, "Discovering" in 3D, and the interpretive dimension of "Understanding" in iTRUST (2, 5–7). This phase is intended to explore not only what was done, but why people acted in certain ways, delving into the mental models and interpersonal dynamics that guided the team's actions.

An innovation of the model is "Suggestions." This block is not explicitly separated in other models. In PEARLS, it would be part of "Application/Summary"; in iTRUST, it would be part of "Solutions"; and in 3D, it would be part of "Deepening" (5–7). ERASE dedicates a dedicated phase to generating clear and actionable recommendations. The model thus reinforces the link between reflective analysis and concrete behavioral improvement. This differentiation guides both the

facilitator and the participant toward the formulation of specific strategies applicable to real-life scenarios.

Finally, "Teachings" corresponds to "Application/Summary" in PEARLS, "Summarize" in GAS, is part of "Deepening" in 3D, and is equivalent to "Take-home message" in iTRUST (2, 5–7). It seeks to consolidate the learning achieved, review training objectives, and facilitate their transfer to clinical practice. The term "Teachings" emphasizes that the debriefing should provide clear conclusions, commitments to change, and a shared vision of the acquired learning.

ERASE is a functional synthesis of the aforementioned models, maintaining their theoretical foundation. It structures its phases in an operational, progressive, and coherent manner. It seeks simplicity, clarity, and systematicity, in addition to being easy for Spanish-speaking instructors to understand and remember. The development of a facilitator's manual is currently being planned, including practical recommendations on time management, conflict resolution, and intercultural adaptation, along with a project to generate an online video library of recorded debriefing sessions.

References.

1. Duff JP, Morse KJ, Seelandt J, et al. Debriefing Methods for Simulation in Healthcare: A Systematic Review. *Simul Healthc*. **2024**, 19(1S), S112-S121. https://doi.org/10.1097/SIH.0000000000000765 .
2. Sawyer T, Eppich W, Brett-Fleegler M, Grant V, Cheng A. More Than One Way to Debrief: A Critical Review of Healthcare Simulation Debriefing Methods. *Simul Healthc*. **2016**, 11(3), 209-217. https://doi.org/10.1097/SIH.0000000000000148
3. Rajendran G, Mahalingam S, KA, et al. The ABCDE (Avoid Shaming/Personal Opinions, Build a Rapport, Choose a Communication Approach, Develop a Debriefing Content, Ensure the Ergonomics of Debriefing) Approach: A Simplified Model for Debriefing During Simulation in Emergency Medicine. *Cureus*. **2023**, 15(2), e34569. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.34569
4. Dogu O, Bozkurt R, Ziyai NY, Elcin M, Aygin D. Use of different debriefing methods after in situ simulation with intensive care unit nurses. *Nurs Crit Care*. **2024**, 29(5), 953-961. https://doi.org/10.1111/NICC.13075
5. Bajaj K, Meguerdichian M, Thoma B, Huang S, Eppich W, Cheng A. The PEARLS Healthcare Debriefing Tool. *Acad Med*. **2018**, 93(2), 336. https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000002035
6. Zigmont JJ, Kappus LJ, Sudikoff SN. The 3D model of debriefing: defusing, discovering, and deepening. *Semin Perinatol*. **2011** , 35(2):52-58. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.simperi.2011.01.003
7. McIndoe A, Grant D. The iTRUST debriefing model. In: *21st Annual Meeting of the Society in Europe for Simulation Applied to Medicine*; **2015** , Jun 24–26; Belfast, Northern Ireland. SESAM 2015 Full Abstracts. p. 202–204. https://pure.au.dk/ws/files/96352647/SESAM_2015_Full_Abstracts.pdf
8. Mitchell S, Blanchard E, Curran V, et al. Effects of Simulation Fidelity on Health Care Providers on Team Training-A Systematic Review. *Simul Healthc*. **2024**, 19(1S), S50-S56. https://doi.org/10.1097/SIH.0000000000000762 .