Paediatric Educators' Special Interest Group

1031 SIMULATION TRAINING FOR VIDEO LARYNGOSCOPY FOR NEONATAL INTUBATION

Simon Jackson, Margaret Sinnott, Jenna Johnston. *NIMDTA*

10.1136/archdischild-2021-rcpch.346

Background Around 1 in 100 neonates are born requiring extensive resuscitation, including intubation.¹ Neonatal intubation is traditionally taught using direct laryngoscopy (DL), and the RCPCH paediatric curriculum emphasises that trainees should be capable of bag/mask ventilating and endotracheal intubation of a neonate. In anaesthetic practise it is encouraged to plan for failure and consider alternate laryngoscopy methods if initial intubation is unsuccessful. Video laryngoscopy (VL) may allow faster time to best view and better views compared to direct laryngoscopy (DL) during intubation of the anatomically normal neonate.² Furthermore, VL can be effective for training purposes allowing real time feedback from senior colleagues and quicker acquisition of intubation skills.³

Objectives The primary objective is to educate paediatricians to use VL. The secondary objective is to assess change in opinions and confidence in VL following simulation training.

Methods Within a district general hospital, 17 participants including 12 paediatric trainees and 5 non-trainee participants (consultants, physicians associates and medical students). Each participant completed a pre and post simulation questionnaire, which included assessment of prior VL education and experience, understanding of planning for failure and confidence in VL technique. Low fidelity simulation training of VL (MacGrath) and airway adjuncts was undertaken by paediatric and anaesthetic colleagues.

Results Of the participants, 8/17 (47%), including only 3/12 (25%) of the trainee group, had received previous training in VL, and 5/17 (29.4%) had previously used VL during real time intubation. In the pre-education group, 4/17 (23.5%) preferred initial intubation attempts using VL, which increased in post education group to 8/17 (47%). In the pre-education group, 6/17 (35.2%) stated they would choose VL for second intubation attempt, which increased in the post-education group to 15/17 (88.2%). In the pre-education group 4/18 (23.5%) stated they would be confident in using VL for second intubation attempt, which increased to 13/17 (76.4%) in the post-education group.

Conclusions VL is a beneficial tool for neonatal intubation and non-invasive surfactant administration, and is a useful for allowing real-time feedback on the procedural skills from a supervising senior. In our study, we demonstrated that VL training and experience wasn't extensive, and following a short education programme, confidence and enthusiasm for VL increased.

REFERENCES

1. Lingappan K, Arnold JL, Fernandes CJ, Pammi M, et al. Videolaryngoscopy versus direct laryngoscopy for tracheal intubation in neonates. *Cochrane Library* 2018; CD009975–CD009975.
2. Fiadjoe JE, Gurnaney H, Dalesio N, Sussman E, et al. A prospective randomized equivalence trial of the glidescope cobalt® Video Laryngoscope to Traditional Direct Laryngoscopy in Neonates and Infants. *Anesthesiology* 2012;116:622–8.
3. O'Shea JE, Thio M, Kamlin CO, McGroarty L, et al. Videolaryngoscopy to Teach Neonatal Intubation: A Randomized Trial. *Pediatrics* 2015;136:912–9.

George Still Forum: ADHD Disorders (ePoster presentations only)

1032 ADVERSE CHILDHOOD EXPERIENCES (ACES) AWARENESS: A TRUST-LEVEL EVALUATION

Vivien Wong-Spracklen, Susan Ozer, Inyang Takon, Vinod Tyagi, Sarah Corrigan. *East and North Hertfordshire NHS Trust*

10.1136/archdischild-2021-rcpch.347

Background Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) are events that can potentially cause lasting adverse impact in later life. By identifying ACEs early in the course of a child's clinical encounter, healthcare members are in positions to help direct appropriate support to the child and family.

Objectives To measure ACEs-awareness levels among healthcare staff dealing with children. To identify barriers preventing healthcare staff from identifying and proactively implementing interventions when encountering ACEs in clinical practice.

Methods A questionnaire survey, held over 7 weeks, was sent to medical staff in acute paediatrics, neonatology, community paediatrics, emergency medicine, and acute maternity services. Email invitations to a GDPR-compliant survey platform was distributed, upon approval from various departmental safeguarding leads. Results were consolidated and analysed using Excel software. Respondents from CAMHS were excluded due to CAMHS operating under a different trust.

Participants were asked about their current awareness of ACEs and their confidence levels using ACEs in their daily clinical practice; where they had received their ACEs-training; and whether they were keen to attend ACEs-training. They were also asked to select from a list, what would be classified as ACEs.

Results 87 responders out of 283 invites (31% response rate) were received. 38 responders (44%) were Nursing staff, 7 (8.0%) were Midwifery staff, 16 (18.5%) Consultants, 2 (2.3%) associate specialists, 15 (17%) specialty registrars, 5 (5.7%) senior house officers, 1 (1.1%) foundation doctor, and 3 (3.4%) allied health professionals (dietician, health play specialist, and advanced nurse practitioner).

Most respondents, 34 (39%) had never heard of ACEs. Only 12 (14%) respondents were confident in applying ACEs in clinical practice.

When shown a list of social circumstances and asked to identify which were ACEs, 75 (86%) correctly identified all ACEs in the list. ACEs that were least recognised by responders were 'Migration' (78, 90% had correctly identified this ACE), 'Parental mental ill-health' and 'Bereavement' (82, 94%).

75 (86%) respondents were unaware of ACEs-training in the Trust. 71 (82%) had never attended ACEs-training before. Of those who did (16; 18%), cited ACEs-training were from Online modules, safeguarding training run by the Local Authority, Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health Level 4 training, or regional paediatric study days, and trust induction.

79 (91%) respondents expressed eagerness to attend ACEs-training. Of the respondents who expressed 'No,' (8, 9%), reasons were: 'Different priorities', 'Unsure of benefits,'