

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

**Implementation of Point of Care Ultrasound in extended focused assessment with sonography for trauma at a rural hospital in Uganda.**

**Rita Nassanga<sup>1</sup>, Sam Bugeza<sup>1</sup>, Ameda Faith<sup>1</sup>, Irene Kabanda<sup>2</sup>, Harriet Nakiberu<sup>3</sup>, Tadeo Semaganda<sup>4</sup>, Francis Olweny<sup>5</sup>, Roy Nagawa<sup>2</sup>, Aloysius Gonzaga Mubuuke<sup>1</sup>**

**1. Makerere University College of Health Sciences, School of Medicine, Department of Radiology.**

**2. Mulago National Referral Hospital, Department of Radiology.**

**3. Mulago Neonatal Specialised and Women’s Hospital, Department of Radiology.**

**4. Kiwoko Hospital, Department of Radiology.**

**5. Makerere University College of Health Sciences, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics.**

**Corresponding Author:**

Rita Nassanga

Department of Radiology, School of Medicine, Makerere University

E-mail: [ritanassanga@gmail.com](mailto:ritanassanga@gmail.com)

Tel. number: +256774280446

21

## ABSTRACT

22 **Introduction:** Focused Assessment with Sonography for Trauma (FAST) is a rapid bedside  
23 ultrasound examination performed at presentation of a trauma patient whereas the extended  
24 FAST (eFAST) examines each hemithorax for the presence of free fluid and air. It is an  
25 'extension' of the trauma clinical assessment process and aids rapid diagnosis with an aim of  
26 identifying free peritoneal fluid which allows for immediate transfer to theatre or further  
27 imaging. FAST can be performed by surgeons, emergency physicians, and paramedics as a  
28 screening test to detect post-traumatic pericardial effusion or hemoperitoneum, performed at  
29 presentation of a trauma patient.

30 **Objective:** The purpose of this study was to evaluate the feasibility of implementing a point of  
31 care ultrasound training in trauma for non-imaging health professionals and evaluate the ability  
32 of the trainees to apply the knowledge and skills gained to perform the ultrasound examination  
33 among trauma patients.

34 **Methods:** It was a prospective cohort study conducted at Kiwoko hospital, a rural based hospital  
35 in Uganda. The study involved developing a curriculum and training of clinicians in point of care  
36 ultrasound for trauma patients through didactic lectures and practical sessions as well as  
37 assessing them at baseline and thereafter further assessment at three months follow up.

### 38 **Results:**

39 A total of 19 clinicians were initially enrolled however, 12 were evaluated at baseline and nine  
40 were followed up for three months. The median length of time in clinical practice of the  
41 clinicians in this study was 11(2-36) months. At baseline, majority of the clinicians correctly  
42 identified and named all the anatomical structures pertinent to images obtained in eFAST; sub-

43 xiphoid view 7(58.3%), right upper quadrant view 5(41.7%), left upper quadrant view 6(50.0%),  
44 suprapubic view 7(58.3%), thoracic-pleural fluid view 7(58.3%), and thoracic-pneumothorax  
45 view 4(33.3%). At follow-up, the clinicians demonstrated acceptable competency in ultrasound  
46 technique when performing eFAST in most views assessed. However, compared to the baseline  
47 observation, a statistically significant decline ( $p=0.001$ ) in image quality was noted in evaluation  
48 of organs in the left upper quadrant.

49 **Conclusion:** Clinicians generally demonstrated acceptable competency in performing eFAST  
50 assessment in trauma patients. With more training, frequent hands-on practice, regulation and  
51 adequate supervision, clinicians can ably perform eFAST procedures to aid in management of  
52 trauma patients.

53 Key words: eFAST; ultrasound; point of care; trauma; rural hospital

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

## INTRODUCTION

63 Focused Assessment with Sonography for Trauma (FAST) is a rapid point-of-care ultrasound  
64 (POCUS) examination performed at the time of presentation of a trauma patient[1]. The use of  
65 POCUS was first described in 1988 in emergency medicine[2]. The extended FAST (eFAST)  
66 examines each hemithorax for the presence of free fluid and air[1]. FAST aids rapid diagnosis  
67 through identifying free peritoneal fluid, assumed to be haemoperitoneum in the context of  
68 trauma which if found, allows for immediate transfer to theatre for life saving interventions [3,  
69 4]. FAST has an overall excellent specificity [3, 5]and high sensitivity for occult  
70 pneumothoraces[6]. It is invariably performed by a formally trained clinician and is considered  
71 an 'extension' of the trauma clinical assessment process, to detect post-traumatic pericardial  
72 effusion or hemoperitoneum, and pneumothorax performed at the time of presentation of a  
73 trauma patient for quick management.

74

75 Trauma is among the leading causes of death and disability in the world[7]. In Africa, road  
76 traffic death rates account for 26.6/100,000 people. In Uganda, where this study was conducted,  
77 road traffic injuries, mainly due to motorcyclists (41 % of accidents) are the leading cause of  
78 abdominal trauma and the third leading cause of hospital admissions and mortality[3]. There are  
79 24 people killed per 100 road crashes and on average, Uganda loses 10 people per day in road traffic  
80 accidents making it the highest level in East Africa[7]. Before FAST/eFAST, invasive procedures  
81 such as peritoneal lavage and exploratory laparotomy were commonly utilized to diagnose  
82 visceral injury[4]. FAST/eFAST in trauma aids immediate diagnosis, is non-invasive, readily  
83 available and plays a pivotal role in the initial diagnosis of trauma-related visceral injuries, but  
84 remains under-utilized especially in low resource contexts[6]. POCUS shows significant

85 improvement in performance of ultrasound by physicians, following hands on practical  
86 training[8]. Despite known diagnostic values, the utilisation of POCUS in emergencies is low  
87 and is proportional to the level of clinical expertise among the users thus training and utility of  
88 POCUS among clinicians and trainees should be further advocated and supported[9]. The number  
89 of imaging specialists in many low resource settings is low and many of them are concentrated  
90 in urban tertiary hospitals. Thus, despite the presence of ultrasound equipment in many rural  
91 based health facilities, there are no trained personnel to operate them leading to delayed or  
92 missed diagnosis.

93

94 In Uganda, the Ministry of Health started supplying ultrasound equipment to district level  
95 hospitals and Health Centers IVs, but this equipment remains under-utilized due to lack of  
96 trained imaging personnel, yet it would be used to conduct rapid assessment of trauma patients.  
97 Therefore, the purpose of the study was to evaluate the feasibility of implementing a point of  
98 care ultrasound training in trauma for non-imaging health professionals and evaluate the ability  
99 of the trainees to apply and retain the knowledge and skills gained to perform the ultrasound  
100 examination among trauma patients.

101

102

## 103 **Materials and Methods**

### 104 **Design and setting**

105 This was a prospective cohort study conducted from 20<sup>th</sup> September 2022 to 30<sup>th</sup> May 2023, at  
106 Kiwoko hospital, a rural based hospital in Uganda. The study involved training of clinicians in

107 eFAST and then following them up to assess their competency in applying the knowledge and  
108 skills gained after three months. Kiwoko hospital has a bed capacity of 250, acts as a referral  
109 health facility for the community catchment area and receives a number of trauma related cases  
110 daily. It has several cadres of health workers including surgeons, medical officers, imaging  
111 technologists, nurses and midwives. There are only two imaging technologists who conduct all  
112 the imaging related examinations.

113

#### 114 **Study population**

115 The participants involved clinical officers, medical officers and surgeons who were purposively  
116 selected. These were initially trained in conducting eFAST because they directly manage trauma  
117 patients. All those who had ever received POCUS training were excluded from the study. A total  
118 of nineteen participants were selected for this training.

119

#### 120 **The eFAST training curriculum**

121 A team of experts in radiology designed the curriculum with well-defined targeted outcomes to  
122 be acquired. The outcomes were related to identification free fluid collection which is a common  
123 among trauma patients. The four basic competency areas where trainees were expected to  
124 demonstrate free fluid collection in trauma patients were: perihepatic space (including Morison's  
125 pouch or the hepatorenal recess), perisplenic space, pericardium, and the pelvis. The trainees  
126 underwent two didactic lectures for four weeks to acquire knowledge about ultrasound and the  
127 examinations they were expected to perform. These lectures focused on basic knowledge of  
128 Ultrasound Physics, Knobology of the ultrasound scan machine, standard technique of

129 systematically performing an ultrasound scan, key trans-abdominal scanning planes of the  
130 abdomen, probe orientation and proper probe selection. They were also trained on how to  
131 identify major abdominal organs, free fluid collection in the abdomen and pleural cavities, free  
132 air in the chest cavity as well as professionalism and ethical conduct including appropriate time  
133 to refer the patient for further radiology assessment.

134 For practical sessions, one healthy participant was selected among the hospital employees and  
135 the other was an ambulant patient with mild ascites and mild pleural effusion. Demonstrations  
136 were carried out by the training experts as the trainees observed. The experts demonstrated the  
137 standard technique and thereafter allowed the trainees to perform the ultrasound examination  
138 with close supervision.

139 Demonstrations focused on both normal findings and pathology so that trainees got acquainted  
140 with both.

#### 141 **Data management and Statistical analysis**

142 Data in this study was analyzed using STATA statistical software version 14. Descriptions were  
143 made using frequencies and percentages. Comparison was made using Fisher's exact test.

144 **Ethical Considerations:** Ethical approval to conduct the study was granted by the School of  
145 Medicine Research Ethics Committee (Mak-SOMREC-2022-307). All study participants  
146 provided written informed consent to participate in the study. Confidentiality of all participants  
147 was ensured and data was only accessible to the researchers.

148

149

#### 150 **Results**

151 Nineteen clinicians were initially trained and all attended the first didactic lecture on eFAST  
152 skills transfer at Kiwoko Hospital. Only 16 attended the second didactic eFAST practical hands  
153 on training whereas 12 underwent baseline eFAST skills evaluation. However, only nine  
154 clinicians were finally evaluated on their eFAST skills three months later following the training.  
155 Table 1 illustrates the different cadres initially trained.

156 **Table 1: Cadres of health workers at Kiwoko Hospital during study timeline**

157

<b>Cadre of health worker</b>	<b>Attended first didactic lecture</b>	<b>Attended second didactic lecture</b>	<b>Baseline evaluation</b>	<b>Excluded</b>	<b>Final evaluation</b>
<b>Surgeons</b>	4	1	1	0	1
<b>Medical officers</b>	11	11	7	2	5
<b>Clinical Officers</b>	4	4	4	1	3

158

159 **Baseline assessment of the trainees**

160 The baseline assessment was carried out two weeks post-training

161 Clinicians demonstrated good skills with the technique used in ultrasound scan in performing  
162 eFAST in each of the eFAST views assessed. About 91.7%(n=11) of the 12 clinicians correctly  
163 positioned the probe and oriented selection marker on the sub-xiphoid eFAST view.  
164 Furthermore, majority of the clinicians obtained either outstanding images with no suggestions



165 for improvements or excellent images with minor suggestions for improvement in each of the  
166 five eFAST views. For instance, in sub-xiphoid view, 5 (41.7%) clinicians obtained outstanding  
167 quality images with no suggestions for improvement and an equal number of clinicians- 5  
168 (41.7%) also obtained quality excellent images with minor suggestions for improvement.  
169 Generally, majority of the clinicians correctly identified and named all the anatomical structures  
170 pertinent to images obtained in eFAST; sub-xiphoid view 7(58.3%), right upper quadrant (RUQ)  
171 view 5(41.7%), left upper(LUQ) quadrant view 6(50.0%), suprapubic view 7(58.3%), thoracic-  
172 pleural fluid view 7(58.3%), and thoracic-pneumothorax view 4(33.3%).  
173 Clinicians also majorly correctly acquired interpreted images to answer all relevant eFAST  
174 questions in; sub-xiphoid view 6(50.0%), right upper quadrant view 5(41.7%), left upper quadrant  
175 view 5(41.7%), suprapubic view 7(58.3%), thoracic-pleural fluid view 6(50.0%),. The clinicians  
176 were also able to interpret some but not all relevant eFAST questions in thoracic-pneumothorax  
177 view 4(33.3%). Table 2 summarizes the baseline evaluation of the trainees.

178

179 **Table 2: Baseline findings two weeks after training of 12 clinicians on principles of point of**  
180 **care ultrasound in focused assessment with sonography in trauma at Kiwoko hospital,**  
181 **Uganda**

<b>Scoring</b>	<b>FAST views</b>					<b>extension</b>
	<b>sub-xiphoid n(%)</b>	<b>RUQ n(%)</b>	<b>LUQ n(%)</b>	<b>Supra-pubic n(%)</b>	<b>Pleural fluid n(%)</b>	<b>Pneumo-Thorax n(%)</b>

<b>Probe Positioning</b>						
correct	11(91.7)	11(91.7)	12(100.0)	12(0.0)	11(91.7)	10(83.3)
incorrect	1(8.3)	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	2(16.7)
<b>Orientation of selection marker</b>						
correct	11(91.7)	12(100.0)	12(100.0)	12(0.0)	11(91.7)	10(83.3)
incorrect	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	2(16.7)
<b>Identified Anatomy and</b>						
correctly & named all structures pertinent to image	7(58.3)	5(41.7)	6(50.0)	7(58.3)	7(58.3)	4(33.3)
correctly & named some structures pertinent to image, did not know all	3(25.0)	6(50.0)	4(33.3)	5(41.7)	1(8.3)	3(25.0)
correctly and named some structures but incorrectly identified and named others	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	3(25.0)	2(16.7)
could not identify or name pertinent structures or named them all	2(16.7)	1(8.3)	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	3(25.0)

incorrectly						
<b>Image quality</b>						
outstanding images, no suggestions for improvement	5(41.7)	7(58.3)	3(25.0)	5(41.7)	4(33.3)	3(25.0)
excellent images, minor suggestions for improvement	5(41.7)	1(8.3)	5(41.7)	5(41.7)	4(33.3)	2(16.7)
good images, acceptable for interpretation	1(8.3)	3(25.0)	2(16.7)	2(16.7)	0(0.0)	3(25.0)
poor images, some anatomy discernible but not sufficient for interpretation	1(8.3)	1(8.3)	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	3(25.0)	1(8.3)
no meaningful image generated	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	3(25.0)
<b>Interpretation</b>						
correctly acquired & interpreted images to answer all relevant eFAST questions	6(50.0)	5(41.7)	5(41.7)	7(58.3)	6(50.0)	3(25.0)

correctly acquired images & was able to interpret some but not all relevant eFAST questions	4(33.3)	4(33.3)	3(25.0)	4(33.3)	2(16.7)	4(33.3)
correctly acquired images but incorrectly interpreted some of them	1(8.3)	3(25.0)	3(25.0)	1(8.3)	3(25.0)	2(16.7)
did not acquire images sufficient for interpretation to answer eFAST questions	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	3(25.0)

182 RUQ-right upper quadrant, LUQ-left upper quadrant, eFAST- extended focused assessment with

183 sonography in trauma

184

185 **Follow up after three months**

186 Evaluation of clinicians' skills in performing eFAST at three months of follow up was good in

187 almost all the eFAST views assessed. However, a non-statistically significant decline ( $p=0.444$ )

188 was noted in which 4(44.4%) incorrectly positioned the probe on the right upper quadrant and on

189 the pneumothorax eFAST view.

190 In addition, at three months follow up, the majority of the clinicians did not obtain outstanding  
191 images with no suggestions for improvements in almost all the five eFAST views, but rather  
192 obtained excellent images with minor suggestions for improvement in each of the five eFAST  
193 views. For instance, in sub-xiphoid view, none of them obtained outstanding quality images with  
194 no suggestions for improvement, but 6(66.7%) of them obtained quality excellent images with  
195 minor suggestions for improvement in the same eFAST view. This observation (decline from  
196 baseline findings) however was not statistically significant ( $p=1.000$ ). A statistically significant  
197 decline from baseline findings ( $p=0.001$ ) in image quality was noted in evaluation of organs in  
198 LUQ eFAST view. It was noted that 3(33.3%) clinicians did not generate meaningful images in  
199 LUQ and 4(44.4%) generated images that were good and acceptable for interpretation.

200 At three months follow up, the clinicians correctly acquired and interpreted images to answer all  
201 relevant eFAST questions in all the five eFAST views. No significant decline was noted but  
202 rather a slight non statistically significant ( $p>0.05$ ) improvement. Table 3 summarizes this  
203 evaluation at three months follow-up assessment of the trainees.

204

205 **Table 3: Three months follow-up findings after training of clinicians on principles of point**  
206 **of care ultrasound in focused assessment with sonography in trauma at Kiwoko hospital,**  
207 **Uganda**

<b>Scoring for</b>	<b>FAST views</b>					<b>extension</b>
	<b>sub-xiphoid</b>	<b>RUQ n(%)</b>	<b>LUQ n(%)</b>	<b>Supra-pubic</b>	<b>Pleural fluid</b>	<b>Pneumo-Thorax</b>

	<b>n(%)</b>			<b>n(%)</b>	<b>n(%)</b>	<b>n(%)</b>
<b>Probe Positioning (p-value)</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>0.444</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>0.444</b>
correct	9(100.0)	5(55.6)	6(66.7)	9(100.0)	5(55.6)	5(55.6)
incorrect	0(0.0)	4(44.4)	3(33.3)	0(0.0)	4(44.4)	4(44.4)
<b>Orientation of selection marker (p-value)</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>**</b>	<b>0.333</b>
correct	5(55.6)	6(66.7)	6(66.7)	8(88.9)	6(66.7)	6(66.7)
incorrect	4(44.4)	3(33.3)	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	3(33.3)
<b>Identified Anatomy (p-value)</b>	<b>0.762</b>	<b>0.505</b>	<b>0.881</b>	<b>0.083</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.517</b>
and correctly & named all structures pertinent to image	6(66.7)	4(44.4)	1(11.1)	7(77.8)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)
and correctly & named some structures pertinent to image, did not know all	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	5(55.6)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)
and correctly and named some structures but incorrectly identified and named others	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(44.4)	1(11.1)
but could not identify or name pertinent structures or	0(0.0)	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(44.4)

named them all incorrectly						
<b>Image quality (p-value)</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.190</b>	<b>0.001*</b>	<b>0.226</b>	<b>0.743</b>	<b>0.505</b>
outstanding images, no suggestions for improvement	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(22.2)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
excellent images, minor suggestions for improvement	6(66.7)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	4(44.4)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)
good images, acceptable for interpretation	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	4(44.4)	3(33.3)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)
poor images, some anatomy discernible but not sufficient for interpretation	0(0.0)	2(22.2)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(22.2)
no meaningful image generated	0(0.0)	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	0(0.0)	4(44.4)	3(33.3)
<b>Interpretation (p-value)</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.943</b>	<b>0.571</b>	<b>0.762</b>	<b>0.714</b>	<b>1.000</b>
correctly acquired & interpreted images to answer all relevant eFAST questions	8(88.9)	3(33.3)	3(33.3)	6(66.7)	4(44.4)	2(22.2)
correctly acquired images & was able to interpret	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	0(0.00)	2(22.2)

some but not all relevant eFAST questions						
correctly acquired images but incorrectly interpreted some of them	0(0.0)	1(11.1)	0(0.0)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	0(0.0)
did not acquire images sufficient for interpretation to answer eFAST questions	0(0.0)	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	0(0.0)	4(44.4)	5(55.6)

208 RUQ-right upper quadrant, LUQ-left upper quadrant, eFAST- extended focused assessment with  
 209 sonography in trauma, \*\* comparison with Fisher’s exact test could not be made so no p-value  
 210 was obtained, \* significant p-value corresponding to Fisher’s exact test.

211 **Clinicians’ use of ultrasound scan during three months follow up period**

212 From Table 4, it is evident that 4(44.4%) of the clinicians had performed the ultrasound scan  
 213 procedure during the follow up period. It also shows that the use of ultrasound changed clinical  
 214 patient management in 3(33.3%) of the clinicians more than half of the time. From the same  
 215 table, one can observe that in the three months follow up period, three of the four scans that  
 216 clinicians performed were in the second month of follow up and the 4<sup>th</sup> scan was in either the 3<sup>rd</sup>  
 217 or the 1<sup>st</sup> month of follow up.

218

219

220

221



222 **Table 4: Clinicians practical experience in use of ultrasound scan after training on**  
 223 **principles of point of care ultrasound in focused assessment with sonography in trauma at**  
 224 **Kiwoko hospital, Uganda**

Characteristic	frequency	percentage
<b>Have you performed an US procedure in the last 3 months</b>		
yes	4	44.4
no	5	55.6
<b>Number of US performed by self in the last 3 months</b>		
0 scans	5	55.6
1-5 scans	4	44.4
6-9 scans	0	0
10-20 scans	0	0
>20 scans	0	0
<b>Number of US performed by self over past 1 month</b>		
0 scans	6	66.7
1-5 scans	3	33.3
6-9 scans	0	0
10-20 scans	0	0
>20 scans	0	0
<b>Number of US performed by self over past 1 week</b>		
0 scans	9	100.0
1-5 scans	0	0

6-9 scans	0	0
10-20 scans	0	0
>20 scans	0	0
<b>In the past month, has the use of US changed your clinical patient management</b>		
never	4	44.4
yes, less than half of the time	1	11.1
yes, about half of the time	1	11.1
yes, more than half of the time	3	33.3
<b>In the past month, how frequently has the use of US led you to refer a patient to a referral hospital</b>		
never	9	100.0
yes, less than half of the time	0	0
yes, about half of the time	0	0
yes, more than half of the time	0	0
<b>In the past month, how frequently has the use of US led you to perform a procedure on a patient</b>		
never	7	77.8
yes, less than half of the time	2	22.2
yes, about half of the time	0	0
yes, more than half of the time	0	0
<b>On a scale from 1-5, rate your level of comfort in acquiring</b>		

<b>images with US machine</b>		
1	0	0
2	2	22.2
3	2	22.2
4	4	44.4
5	1	11.1
<b>Do you agree with the statement the use of US is useful to my practice</b>		
yes, strongly agree	6	66.7
yes, somewhat agree	3	33.3
no opinion	0	0
no, somewhat disagree	0	0
no, strongly disagree	0	0

225

226

227

## 228 **Discussion**

229 The purpose of this study was to evaluate the feasibility of implementing point of care ultrasound  
230 training in trauma for non-imaging health professionals and evaluate the ability of the trainees to  
231 apply the knowledge and skills gained to perform the ultrasound examination in trauma patients.  
232 This study brought out strengths and limitations of the eFAST PoCUS training program as well  
233 as opportunities for further improvement reported in other literature as well.

234 The baseline assessment was conducted two weeks post training. At baseline assessment, there  
235 was an overall outstanding performance of over 90% in transducer positioning and orientation  
236 whereas anatomy, image quality and interpretation of findings were performed averagely with  
237 the best performance in suprapubic, followed by sub-xiphoid, pleural fluid, and RUQ views. The  
238 LUQ and pneumothorax views had the least performance with scores of as low as 25% in image  
239 interpretation and quality of image. This finding is in agreement with a previous study which  
240 trained paramedics where the best performance was in the suprapubic, RUQ and pneumothorax  
241 views but on the contrary, the least performance was in the subxiphoid view[10, 11]. However  
242 another study on eFAST demonstrated poor performance by clinicians in the evaluation of  
243 pneumothorax using ultrasound[11]. Our findings may not be surprising given that trainees  
244 generally performed well in most areas because they had just been trained and therefore, the  
245 knowledge gained was presumably still fresh in their minds. The least performance scored in  
246 LUQ and pneumothorax views could possibly be explained by the fact that even in normal  
247 imaging practice by qualified imaging experts, these views usually require adequate time and  
248 rigorous practice to perform well. Therefore, when it comes to health workers with no imaging  
249 background at all, such a performance may not be surprising. Our overall baseline scores was  
250 64% compared to a Kenyan National pilot to train clinicians, where the baseline score was 70%  
251 with a 10% improvement in practical and written assessments within a space of five months[12].  
252 Another study to train final year medical students had a baseline score of 88%[13] while a  
253 similar study for rural healthcare providers similar to our setting had a baseline score of  
254 74%[13].

255 Assessment at three months follow up also demonstrated the best performance to be in  
256 suprapubic and subxiphoid views with scores of 71% and 62% respectively while the least

257 performance was similar to baseline with lowest scores of 36% and 33.4% respectively in the  
258 LUQ and pneumothorax views. On the contrary, in a study by Duke et al who trained  
259 paramedics, the follow up conducted at two months reported that the best performance was in the  
260 RUQ and pneumothorax views and the least performance was in the subxiphoid and suprapubic  
261 views[9] We also noted that there was an overall decline of 26.2% in all the parameters assessed  
262 with a 22% decline in probe positioning, 27% decline in orientation, 15% decline in anatomy,  
263 and 90% decline in image quality but there was an 8.7% improvement in image interpretation  
264 whereas PoCUS study in kenya had an improvement of 5% in the test scores at three and six  
265 months[14].

266 Assessment of clinicians after three months showed that approximately 50% of the clinicians  
267 actually performed eFAST ultrasound on their own following the training compared to 85% use  
268 of eFAST POCUS by interns in the emergency department in Thailand.

269 In this study, we generally note that trainees had lower scores than what has been reported in  
270 other literature. The possible explanation for this is not very clear-cut, however, this could  
271 possibly be due to the nature of the training, duration of the training as well as competing work  
272 demands of the trainees. All our trainees were still full time employees expected to attend to their  
273 duty in the hospital and as such they had limited time to concentrate and there was no dedicated  
274 time for training. This forced them to be in and out of training as they had to attend to patients  
275 which ultimately affected their concentration. Second, we had shorter training times and the  
276 trainees had few contact hours with the trainers when compared to other studies reported. It is  
277 thus most likely that the limited contact time with trainers did not avail the trainees with enough  
278 practical exposure. This observation however brings out significant pointers as we move into

279 implementing eFAST POCUS among non-imaging health workers. First, for someone to  
280 competently perform eFAST to acceptable levels, there must be enough time set aside to train to  
281 gain both knowledge and skills. Second, contact supervision with a qualified imaging expert for  
282 a prolonged period of time is more likely to result in better eventual competency and proficiency  
283 when compared to shorter training periods that are also affected by other competing work  
284 demands. Therefore, settings where eFAST POCUS is being implemented need to think about  
285 these observations and ensure that there is adequate training time, support supervision and  
286 protected time for trainees.

287 A number of studies have reported about the success of eFAST and POCUS, mainly from high  
288 income countries[10, 11, 13]. This study conducted in Uganda contributes to this body of  
289 knowledge from the context of low-resource settings. The fact that we implemented this POCUS  
290 study at a rural based hospital with high volumes of patient numbers and very few health workers  
291 is a strength of the study as it demonstrates that POCUS in trauma patients can be implemented  
292 if the necessary resources and time are available. The trainees in this study demonstrated some  
293 level of retention of knowledge and skills post training and with support supervision and follow  
294 up training, such trainees can attain acceptable levels of competency. Few trainees were retained  
295 for subsequent follow up which is a major limitation of the study, but it also highlights the  
296 challenges low-resource settings are likely to encounter when implementing POCUS because of  
297 high turnover and thus the remaining few get overwhelmed. In this study, we did not intend to  
298 conduct a highly powerful bed-side skills assessment with high psychometric rigor involving a  
299 number of trauma cases. We thus encourage further research in areas implementing POCUS to  
300 conduct rigorous longitudinal skills assessments for both knowledge and skills retention at the  
301 bedside.

302

### 303 **Conclusion**

304 This study has demonstrated that with adequate training and support supervision, clinicians  
305 without prior exposure to ultrasound can perform the eFAST exam and recognize abnormal fluid  
306 collections and pathology in trauma patients. Although we noted a decline at follow-up in image  
307 quality and low performance in the LUQ and pneumothorax views, overall, the trainees that were  
308 followed up demonstrated acceptable retention of basic knowledge and skills. There is need for  
309 continuous training, regulation and support supervision to improve efficiency in areas of poor  
310 performance. The training has the potential to improve eFAST knowledge and skills amongst  
311 clinicians in rural areas if adequate resources such as longer contact hours, support supervision  
312 and protected time to train are in place. The utility of eFAST POCUS among clinicians should be  
313 further advocated for and supported.

314

315

316

317

### 318 **REFERENCES**

- 319 1. Bloom, B.A. and R.C. Gibbons, *Focused assessment with sonography for trauma*. 2017.
- 320 2. Mayron, R., et al., *Echocardiography performed by emergency physicians: impact on diagnosis*  
321 *and therapy*. *Ann Emerg Med*, 1988. **17**(2): p. 150-4.

- 322 3. Netherton, S., et al., *Diagnostic accuracy of eFAST in the trauma patient: a systematic review*  
323 *and meta-analysis*. *Cjem*, 2019. **21**(6): p. 727-738.
- 324 4. Kim, D.J., et al., *Point of Care Ultrasound Literature Primer: Key Papers on Focused Assessment*  
325 *With Sonography in Trauma (FAST) and Extended FAST*. *Cureus*, 2022. **14**(10): p. e30001.
- 326 5. Akoglu, H., et al., *Diagnostic accuracy of the Extended Focused Abdominal Sonography for*  
327 *Trauma (E-FAST) performed by emergency physicians compared to CT*. *Am J Emerg Med*, 2018.  
328 **36**(6): p. 1014-1017.
- 329 6. Kirkpatrick, A.W., et al., *Hand-held thoracic sonography for detecting post-traumatic*  
330 *pneumothoraces: the Extended Focused Assessment with Sonography for Trauma (EFAST)*. *J*  
331 *Trauma*, 2004. **57**(2): p. 288-95.
- 332 7. AFRICA, U.N.E.C.F., *Uganda Road Safety Performance Review Report*. 2016.
- 333 8. Ienghong, K., et al., *Point of Care Ultrasound Use by Interns in Emergency Department*. *Open*  
334 *Access Macedonian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 2021. **9**(E): p. 588-591.
- 335 9. Krogh, C.L., et al., *Effect of ultrasound training of physicians working in the prehospital setting*.  
336 *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med*, 2016. **24**: p. 99.
- 337 10. Dudek, M., et al., *Performance and skill retention of extended focused assessment with*  
338 *sonography for trauma for the paramedics*. *Anaesth Crit Care Pain Med*, 2021. **40**(1): p. 100784.
- 339 11. Maximus, S., et al., *eFAST for Pneumothorax: Real-Life Application in an Urban Level 1 Center by*  
340 *Trauma Team Members*. *Am Surg*, 2018. **84**(2): p. 220-224.
- 341 12. Bell, G., B. Wachira, and G. Denning, *A pilot training program for point-of-care ultrasound in*  
342 *Kenya*. *Afr J Emerg Med*, 2016. **6**(3): p. 132-137.
- 343 13. Cevik, A.A., et al., *Assessment of EFAST training for final year medical students in emergency*  
344 *medicine clerkship*. *Turk J Emerg Med*, 2018. **18**(3): p. 100-104.



- 345 14. Wanjiku, G.W., G. Bell, and B. Wachira, *Assessing a novel point-of-care ultrasound training*  
346 *program for rural healthcare providers in Kenya*. BMC Health Serv Res, 2018. **18**(1): p. 607.

347

**Table 1: Cadres of health workers at Kiwoko Hospital during study timeline**

Cadre of health worker	Attended first didactic lecture	Attended second didactic lecture	Baseline evaluation	Excluded	Final evaluation
Surgeons	4	1	1	0	1
Medical officers	11	11	7	2	5
Clinical Officers	4	4	4	1	3

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.21.23300400>; this version posted December 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

**Table 2: Baseline findings two weeks after training of 12 clinicians on principles of point of care ultrasound in focused assessment with sonography in trauma at Kiwoko hospital, Uganda**

Scoring	FAST views					extension
	sub-xiphoid n(%)	RUQ n(%)	LUQ n(%)	Supra-pubic n(%)	Pleural fluid n(%)	Pneumo-Thorax n(%)
<b>Probe Positioning</b>						
correct	11(91.7)	11(91.7)	12(100.0)	12(0.0)	11(91.7)	10(83.3)
incorrect	1(8.3)	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	2(16.7)
<b>Orientation of selection marker</b>						
correct	11(91.7)	12(100.0)	12(100.0)	12(0.0)	11(91.7)	10(83.3)
incorrect	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	2(16.7)
<b>Identified Anatomy and</b>						
correctly & named all structures pertinent to image	7(58.3)	5(41.7)	6(50.0)	7(58.3)	7(58.3)	4(33.3)
correctly & named some structures pertinent to image, did not know all	3(25.0)	6(50.0)	4(33.3)	5(41.7)	1(8.3)	3(25.0)
correctly and named some structures but incorrectly identified and named others	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	3(25.0)	2(16.7)
could not identify or name pertinent structures or	2(16.7)	1(8.3)	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	3(25.0)

named them all incorrectly						
<b>Image quality</b>						
outstanding images, no suggestions for improvement	5(41.7)	7(58.3)	3(25.0)	5(41.7)	4(33.3)	3(25.0)
excellent images, minor suggestions for improvement	5(41.7)	1(8.3)	5(41.7)	5(41.7)	4(33.3)	2(16.7)
good images, acceptable for interpretation	1(8.3)	3(25.0)	2(16.7)	2(16.7)	0(0.0)	3(25.0)
poor images, some anatomy discernible but not sufficient for interpretation	1(8.3)	1(8.3)	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	3(25.0)	1(8.3)
no meaningful image generated	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	3(25.0)
<b>Interpretation</b>						
correctly acquired & interpreted images to answer all relevant eFAST questions	6(50.0)	5(41.7)	5(41.7)	7(58.3)	6(50.0)	3(25.0)
correctly acquired images & was able to interpret some but not all relevant eFAST questions	4(33.3)	4(33.3)	3(25.0)	4(33.3)	2(16.7)	4(33.3)
correctly acquired images but incorrectly interpreted some of them	1(8.3)	3(25.0)	3(25.0)	1(8.3)	3(25.0)	2(16.7)
did not acquire images sufficient for interpretation to answer eFAST questions	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	0(0.0)	1(8.3)	3(25.0)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.21.23300400>; this version posted December 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

RUQ-right upper quadrant, LUQ-left upper quadrant, eFAST- extended focused assessment with sonography in trauma

**Table 3: Three months follow-up findings after training of clinicians on principles of point of care ultrasound in focused assessment with sonography in trauma at Kiwoko hospital, Uganda**

<b>Scoring for</b>	<b>FAST views</b>					<b>extension</b>
	<b>sub-xiphoid n(%)</b>	<b>RUQ n(%)</b>	<b>LUQ n(%)</b>	<b>Supra-pubic n(%)</b>	<b>Pleural fluid n(%)</b>	<b>Pneumo-Thorax n(%)</b>
<b>Probe Positioning (p-value)</b>	**	0.444	**	**	**	0.444
correct	9(100.0)	5(55.6)	6(66.7)	9(100.0)	5(55.6)	5(55.6)
incorrect	0(0.0)	4(44.4)	3(33.3)	0(0.0)	4(44.4)	4(44.4)
<b>Orientation of selection marker (p-value)</b>	**	**	**	**	**	0.333
correct	5(55.6)	6(66.7)	6(66.7)	8(88.9)	6(66.7)	6(66.7)
incorrect	4(44.4)	3(33.3)	3(33.3)	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	3(33.3)
<b>Identified Anatomy (p-value)</b>	0.762	0.505	0.881	0.083	1.000	0.517
and correctly & named all structures pertinent to image	6(66.7)	4(44.4)	1(11.1)	7(77.8)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)
and correctly & named some structures pertinent to image, did not know all	2(22.2)	1(11.1)	5(55.6)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)
and correctly and named some structures but incorrectly identified and named others	1(11.1)	2(22.2)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(44.4)	1(11.1)
but could not identify or name pertinent structures or named them all incorrectly	0(0.0)	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(44.4)
<b>Image quality (p-value)</b>	1.000	0.190	0.001*	0.226	0.743	0.505
outstanding images, no suggestions for improvement	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(22.2)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)
excellent images, minor suggestions for improvement	6(66.7)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	4(44.4)	2(22.2)	2(22.2)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.21.23300400>; this version posted December 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

good images, acceptable for interpretation	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	4(44.4)	3(33.3)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)
poor images, some anatomy discernible but not sufficient for interpretation	0(0.0)	2(22.2)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	2(22.2)
no meaningful image generated	0(0.0)	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	0(0.0)	4(44.4)	3(33.3)
<b>Interpretation (p-value)</b>	<b>1.000</b>	<b>0.943</b>	<b>0.571</b>	<b>0.762</b>	<b>0.714</b>	<b>1.000</b>
correctly acquired & interpreted images to answer all relevant eFAST questions	8(88.9)	3(33.3)	3(33.3)	6(66.7)	4(44.4)	2(22.2)
correctly acquired images & was able to interpret some but not all relevant eFAST questions	1(11.1)	3(33.3)	3(33.3)	2(22.2)	0(0.00)	2(22.2)
correctly acquired images but incorrectly interpreted some of them	0(0.0)	1(11.1)	0(0.0)	1(11.1)	1(11.1)	0(0.0)
did not acquire images sufficient for interpretation to answer eFAST questions	0(0.0)	2(22.2)	3(33.3)	0(0.0)	4(44.4)	5(55.6)

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.21.23300400>; this version posted December 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

RUQ-right upper quadrant, LUQ-left upper quadrant, eFAST- extended focused assessment with sonography in trauma, \*\* comparison with Fisher's exact test could not be made so no p-value was obtained, \* significant p-value corresponding to Fisher's exact test.

**Table 4: Clinicians practical experience in use of ultrasound scan after training on principles of point of care ultrasound in focused assessment with sonography in trauma at Kiwoko hospital, Uganda**

Characteristic	frequency	percentage
<b>Have you performed an US procedure in the last 3 months</b>		
yes	4	44.4
no	5	55.6
<b>Number of US performed by self in the last 3 months</b>		
0 scans	5	55.6
1-5 scans	4	44.4
6-9 scans	0	0
10-20 scans	0	0
>20 scans	0	0
<b>Number of US performed by self over past 1 month</b>		
0 scans	6	66.7

1-5 scans	3	33.3
6-9 scans	0	0
10-20 scans	0	0
>20 scans	0	0
<b>Number of US performed by self over past 1 week</b>		
0 scans	9	100.0
1-5 scans	0	0
6-9 scans	0	0
10-20 scans	0	0
>20 scans	0	0
<b>In the past month, has the use of US changed your clinical patient management</b>		
never	4	44.4
yes, less than half of the time	1	11.1
yes, about half of the time	1	11.1
yes, more than half of the time	3	33.3
<b>In the past month, how frequently has the use of US led you to refer a patient to a referral hospital</b>		
never	9	100.0
yes, less than half of the time	0	0
yes, about half of the time	0	0
yes, more than half of the time	0	0
<b>In the past month, how frequently has the use of US led you to perform a procedure on a patient</b>		
never	7	77.8
yes, less than half of the time	2	22.2
yes, about half of the time	0	0
yes, more than half of the time	0	0
<b>On a scale from 1-5, rate your level of comfort in acquiring images with US machine</b>		
1	0	0
2	2	22.2
3	2	22.2
4	4	44.4
5	1	11.1
<b>Do you agree with the statement the use of US is useful to my practice</b>		
yes, strongly agree	6	66.7
yes, somewhat agree	3	33.3
no opinion	0	0
no, somewhat disagree	0	0
no, strongly disagree	0	0

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.21.23300400>; this version posted December 26, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).