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Null Hypothesis

• If medical students, EM residents, and Cardiac fellows are shown an online tutorial explaining how to estimate cardiac ejection fractions (EF), then ultrasound experience and level of training will have no effect on quiz scores
Background

• A 2008 study by Dean et al showed that about a third of all recent emergency medicine (EM) graduates did not feel confident in using an ultrasound machine at the bedside

• Our Objective: While ultrasound is now a required part of EM residency, if ultrasound is introduced earlier in the training process, during medical school, students will have more time to develop skills and will therefore be more confident using bedside ultrasound in emergency department
Background

• Ultrasound utility is operator-dependent – the more time one invests, the more efficiently one can use ultrasound as a diagnostic tool.

  • A 2008 study done by Rao et al at Wayne State University demonstrated that medical students are capable of learning the skills to use ultrasound in a meaningful way.

  • **Our Objective:** If medical students have been shown to use ultrasound in a complex manner, and are taught how to use the ultrasound appropriately, they can invest more time into fine-tuning their skills than if they had started during their residency.
Background

• In 2010, the American College of Emergency Physicians (ACEP) and the American Society of Echocardiography (ASE) recognized the utility of a focused cardiac ultrasound (FOCUS) in a symptomatic patient in the Emergency Department (ED)

• Our Objective: To be able to teach students and residents how to assess cardiac EF as there is real practical value in determining cardiac EF, especially for unstable patients in the ED who require serial monitoring
FOCUS in the ED

- Evaluate patients with cardiac, shock, or shortness of breath for the following:
  - Presence of a pericardial effusion
  - Assessment of global cardiac systolic function
  - Identification of right and left ventricular enlargement
  - Intravascular volume assessment
  - Guidance for pericardiocentesis
  - Confirmation of a transvenous pacing wire
Materials and Methods

• Two former medical students from the class of 2009 at The Ohio State University College of Medicine, Jacqueline Kattner and Sheila Rajashekara, developed a 90-slide PowerPoint and a 50 question quiz
  – The worked closely with two cardiologists to obtain adequate clips

• During that time, the quiz was not distributed
Layout of the Study

- Informed Consent
- A pre-tutorial questionnaire
- PowerPoint tutorial explaining how to estimate cardiac EF
- Quiz asking the participant to
  - Estimate overall functioning (no, mild, moderate, or severe dysfunction)
  - Then attempt to quantify the EF (10-19%, 20-29%, 30-39%, etc)
- Post-tutorial questionnaire

The study was estimated to take 90 minutes to complete.
Methods

• Pre-Tutorial Questionnaire
  – Self-described level of training
  – Hours spent ultrasounding
  – Hours spent watching online tutorials
  – Cardiac ultrasounds performed
  – Confidence for using ultrasound for diagnostic purposes
  – Confidence estimating cardiac EF
  – Level of training, age, and current specialty interest
Methods

• Post-Tutorial Questionnaire
  – Confidence in estimating cardiac EF
  – Level of comfort assessing cardiac EF after seeing the tutorial
  – Utility of the tutorial as they go on in their careers
  – Willingness to go to the Clinical Skills Center to improve technique
Methods

• The study surveys, tutorial, and quiz were on an electronic classroom interface, Carmen
Sample

• An email invitation was sent out to
  – Four years of medical students
  – Medical students on leave of absence
  – Three years of EM residents
  – Three years of cardiology fellows
  – This came to approximately 900 invitations

• Exclusion Criteria
  – None
Results so far...

• After about a month after the first email invitation, we have...
  – 32 pre-tutorial questionnaires completed
  – 21 quizzes completed
  – 16 post-tutorial questionnaires completed
Level of Training

Year

1st 2nd 3rd 4th 4HUS PGY-1 PGY-2 PGY-3 PGY-4 PGY-5 PGY-6 PGY-7
## Hours spent ultrasound vs Specialty Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-10 hrs</th>
<th>11-20 hrs</th>
<th>21+ hrs</th>
<th>Pearson chi-square test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Em</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hours Ultrasoundding vs Quiz Score

1 = 0 hrs
2 = 1-5 hrs
3 = 6-11 hrs
4 = 11-15 hrs
5 = 16-20 hrs
6 = 21-30 hrs
7 = 31-40 hrs
8 = 41+ hrs
Hours Ultrasounding vs Quiz Score

• When we correlated hours ultrasounding vs quiz score
  • Pearson Correlation = 0.406
  • Significance = 0.106
# of Cardiac Ultrasounds vs Quiz Score

Number of Scans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quiz Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Scans

- 1-5 scans
- 6-10 scans
- 16-20
- 21-30

Number of Scans
# of Cardiac Ultrasounds vs Quiz Score

- When we correlated the data between these two variables, we found a
  - Pearson Correlation of 0.630
  - Significance of 0.007
Pre- vs Post-Tutorial Confidence Levels

Confidence Levels

Participants

Pre Tutorial
Post Tutorial
Pre- vs Post-Tutorial Confidence Levels
T-Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre Tutorial</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Tutorial</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This demonstrates that confidence levels increase after this tutorial.
### Other Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Question 2</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation = 0.709</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many hours of u/s have you had 1 = 0 hrs, 2 = 1-10 hrs, 3 = 11-20, 4 = 21 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Question 1</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation = 0.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe your level of training. 1 = No training, 2 = Novice, 3 = Intermediate, 4 = Advanced, 5 = Expert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Question 3</td>
<td>Significance &lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many hours have you spent watching online tutorials regarding ultrasound 1 = 0 hrs, 2 = 1-10 hrs, 3 = 11-20, 4 = 21 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significance &lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions So Far

- It appears that number of focused cardiac ultrasounds are what correlate with ability to estimate EF.
- It does NOT appear that hours of ultrasound training, level of training correlate with quiz score.
- Participants who spent time on their own watching online tutorials and who physically performed many ultrasounds were shown to have a strong correlation with how they described their own expertise.
Limitations

• The study is not yet completed
• Our sample is small
• Many participants are not following the study through till the end
  – 13/32 haven’t completed the quiz and/or post-tutorial questionnaire
• We also have a sample bias as all of the participants have some ultrasound background
Limitations

• We are in the process of recruiting more residents
• Some students have technical difficulties when using a Mac Computer and others have reported difficulties when trying to stream the videos
• We have not yet done a question analysis to see which questions are useful and which ones are not
• The time commitment is fairly large for a voluntary study
Where we hope to go from here…

• We hope that this study will demonstrate that medical students can qualitatively assess cardiac ejection fraction
  – Possible integration into the first/second year medical curriculum
  – Integration into 3rd/4th year EM/Cardiology clerkships

• Construct a study asking students to OBTAIN cardiac ultrasounds and estimate EF
Questions?
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