

1 **Title:**

2 Co-designed point-of-care ultrasound program development and implementation at a Veterans
3 Affairs Emergency Department

4 **Manuscript category:** Original research

5 **Authors:**

6 Rebecca G. Theophanous, MD, MHSc^{1,2}; Catherine A. Staton, MD, MScGH^{1,3}; Luna C.
7 Ragsdale, MD, MPH^{1,2}; Anna Tupetz, DPT, MScGH^{1,3}; Erica Peethumnongsin, MD, PhD¹;
8 Stephanie A. Eucker, MD, PhD¹

9 **Affiliations:** Department of Emergency Medicine, Duke University School of Medicine¹;
10 Durham Veterans Affairs Healthcare System²; Duke Global Health Institute, Duke University³;
11 Durham, NC 27710, USA.

12 **Emails:** Rebecca.theophanous@duke.edu; catherine.staton@duke.edu; luna.ragsdale@va.gov;
13 anna.tupetz@duke.edu; esp20@duke.edu; staphanie.eucker@duke.edu

14 **Corresponding author:** Rebecca G. Theophanous, MD, MHSc¹; Duke School of Medicine,
15 Department of Emergency Medicine, 2301 Erwin Rd, Durham, NC, 27705;
16 Rebecca.theophanous@duke.edu. ORCID: [0000-0003-0697-3703](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0697-3703).

17 **Short running title:** [Development of a novel POCUS program using co-design methods at a VA](#)
18 [ED](#)

19 [Research was presented at the Mediterranean Emergency Medicine Conference meeting in](#)
20 [Rhodes, Greece, September 2023](#)

21 [Word count: 3970](#)

22 **Funding and Conflicts of Interest:** This study was funded by SAEMF-AEUS grant #AG 2020-
23 0000000099. The funders had no role in the design or execution of the study. There are no other
24 conflicts of interest to report.

25 **Role of participants:**

26 RGT (study PI; project lead/design/oversight, coordinating amongst collaborators and research
27 personnel, establishing US documentation/storage/archiving process, weekly US QA process,
28 monthly US training sessions, data collection, data analysis, writing and presentation of the
29 findings). CAS (study design, co-design methodology, grant writing, manuscript revisions). LCR
30 (VA ED Chief; project mentor, study design, monthly meetings, collaboration with VA staff and
31 ED leadership support of POCUS endeavors, grant/manuscript review). AT (implementation
32 science mentor, instructed and trained PI and team on coding, qualitative data analysis, and
33 manuscript review). ESP (Duke EM Ultrasound Director; project mentor, study design, feedback
34 on US processes and troubleshooting, grant/manuscript revisions). SAE (Duke EM Assistant
35 Research Director; project mentor, assisted with study personnel enrollment, supervised coding
36 training and qualitative data analysis, manuscript writing and revisions).

37 **Title:**

38 Co-designed point-of-care ultrasound program development and implementation at a Veterans
39 Affairs Emergency Department

40 **Abstract:**

41 Integrating point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) into patient care requires a multi-faceted
42 culture change using a multi-pronged approach. A standardized implementation method is
43 lacking for POCUS program sustainability. We developed a standardized training curriculum
44 and clinical POCUS documentation, archival, and image review process at a single Veterans
45 Affairs Emergency Department (ED). We hypothesized that co-designed development and
46 implementation of the multifaceted POCUS intervention would maximize ED provider
47 uptake and sustainability.

48 Using Participatory Action Research (PAR) and adapted Experience-Based Co-design
49 (EBCD) methods, stakeholders collaboratively co-designed our POCUS intervention to
50 optimize implementation. Using the PRODUCES framework, twelve stakeholder
51 participants (co-creators including study researchers, ultrasound faculty, ED leadership, and
52 ED providers (POCUS end-users)) met in four monthly co-design meetings from July to
53 October 2021 to brainstorm, discuss, refine, and finalize the POCUS intervention and
54 implementation plan.

55 Throughout the co-design process, stakeholders reviewed findings from prior meetings,
56 reflected on successes and failures, and held open discussions on refining and finalizing the
57 proposed POCUS educational and clinical program. By involving stakeholders as co-creators
58 throughout the co-design process, we maximized end-user POCUS enthusiasm, program

59 uptake, and sustained use. This simple, streamlined, and generalizable user-centered co-
60 design method serves as a framework for future POCUS implementation and dissemination
61 plans.

62 **Keywords:** point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS), experience-based co-design, participatory
63 action research, end-user engagement, healthcare innovation, Veterans Affairs healthcare
64 system

65 **I. Introduction:**

66 Point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) augments diagnostic and procedural clinical patient care in
67 emergency departments (ED) and hospitals nationwide as a low-cost, safe, and increasingly
68 available bedside tool.[1,2] ED providers are frequent POCUS users and are at the forefront of
69 POCUS education and innovation, with prior ED studies showing that POCUS use expedites
70 bedside care and improves patient satisfaction and clinical outcomes.[1,2] However, a
71 sustainable POCUS program requires a significant multi-faceted procedural and cultural change
72 for new users--including incorporating regular POCUS use into clinical practice, and
73 implementation of standardized education, image documentation, storage, and quality review
74 processes.[3,4] Gaps in POCUS training and lack of program infrastructure still exist, and a
75 standardized user-centered implementation plan remains elusive, particularly among community
76 EDs and within the Veterans Affairs (VA) healthcare system.[5-8] The VA healthcare system is
77 the largest integrated healthcare system in the United States and serves over 2 million veterans in
78 EDs and urgent cares annually. Nationwide, these settings frequently comprise heterogenous
79 groups of providers from different medical specialties (e.g., emergency medicine, internal
80 medicine, and family medicine), training backgrounds (e.g., MD, DO, NP, and PA), and clinical

81 practice environments (e.g. rural, urban, different patient volumes), thus is difficult to tailor an
82 educational or clinical intervention toward the whole group rather than specific subgroups.

83 A potential solution for improving healthcare processes and systems currently championed by
84 the VA is the use of co-design for developing sustainable systems.[9-11] Co-design in healthcare
85 research is defined as “*the meaningful involvement of research users during the study planning*
86 *phase of a research project*”.[12] In healthcare research studies, Participatory Action Research
87 (PAR) involves collaboration between researchers and end-users to understand and change
88 systems through active end-user involvement.[12,13] PAR increases the frequency and intensity
89 of end-user engagement and can yield positive feedback and growth among end-users.[9,12]
90 Applied to POCUS, a systems-based cultural change, rather than a one-way POCUS intervention
91 created by ultrasound faculty for ED providers, must be implemented to achieve an effective and
92 sustainable solution. In addition, we used Evidence-Based Co-Design (EBCD) methods which
93 emphasize setting clear participant expectations and assigning defined participant roles.[13-17]
94 In this way, stakeholder involvement in project design and adaptation aims to achieve maximum
95 acceptability and effectiveness specific to both stakeholders and setting.[9,10] Furthermore, end-
96 user participation through EBCD changes clinical and educational practice through experience-
97 based knowledge. As the implementation strategy components are integrated and grow over a
98 longitudinal timeline, we can continuously evolve and improve our POCUS intervention through
99 repetitive iterative cycles of performance and reflection.[9,13,15,18]

100 Therefore, our aim was to create and implement a multifaceted POCUS intervention involving a
101 standardized POCUS educational curriculum, clinical documentation and archiving system,
102 image review and quality improvement process, and department-wide culture change amongst
103 ED providers at a single site VA ED using PAR and adapted EBCD methods.[9,14-17] Through

104 co-design, our goal was to maximize POCUS uptake and sustainability for users with a wide
105 range of baseline POCUS knowledge and skills, and to develop methods that can serve as a
106 framework for future POCUS implementation efforts.

107 **II. Methods:**

108 **2.1 Study design:** We used co-design PAR and adapted EBCD methodology at the VA ED
109 implementation site to develop and refine a multifaceted POCUS intervention for ED providers
110 that would include both an educational training program and a clinical implementation program
111 with documentation, archiving, image review, and quality improvement processes.[9,12-15,19]
112 Study researchers used the PRODUCES (Problem, Objective, Design, end-Users, Co-creators,
113 Evaluation, Scalability) framework to frame the study aim and identify problems with the POCUS
114 program intervention and implementation strategy (Table 1).[9,14,18] We used the GRIPP2 Long
115 Form for co-designed studies and the Checklist for Reporting Intervention Co-creation.[9,20] Our
116 study was deemed exempt by the VA Institutional Review Board, and consent was waived by the
117 IRB (1631300-4).

118 **Table 1: PRODUCES framework**

Problem – There is a need for sustainable ED POCUS programs but no standardized implementation method.
Objective - Our goal was to develop a POCUS intervention and implementation plan including 1) an educational training curriculum and 2) standardized clinical ED POCUS system (documentation, archival, image review, and quality improvement process) for VA ED providers at a single site ED.
Design - Using Participatory Action Research (PAR) and adapted Experience-Based Co-design (EBCD) methods, we met in four co-design sessions to co-design our POCUS intervention and optimize our implementation process.
end-Users – VA ED providers

Co-creators - Twelve participants (co-creators) including study researchers, ultrasound faculty, ED leadership, and ED providers were involved in the co-design process from July to October 2021.

Evaluation - Throughout the co-design process, we reiterated findings from prior meetings, reflected on what went well or poorly, and held open discussions on refining and finalizing the proposed POCUS program.

Scalability - This streamlined and straightforward user-centered design method can be a framework for future POCUS implementation and dissemination plans.

119
120 2.2 Study Setting: The primary performance site was a 251-bed tertiary care referral, teaching,
121 and research hospital in the VA healthcare system (VAHCS) affiliated with a local academic
122 medical center. The VAHCS ED evaluates and treats approximately 26,000 patients annually.

123 2.3 Study participants and recruitment: We invited primary ED providers, which were those ED
124 providers who worked in the ED on a regular basis (24 attendings and 1 APP). We followed a
125 convenience sampling strategy and recruited participants via word of mouth, emails to the full ED
126 provider list, and announcements at monthly VA ED provider meetings. We also invited VA ED
127 leadership and lead educational faculty who were interested in the POCUS implementation
128 process. We excluded nurses and intermediate care technicians (ICTs or former military corpsmen
129 or medics working in the ED) as their ultrasound training and use differs from that of primary ED
130 providers. Table 2 describes the study inclusion and exclusion criteria. Table 3 describes the
131 stakeholder groups included as co-creators in the co-design process. Study participation was
132 voluntary. Co-creators were all equally involved in the co-design process to represent their
133 viewpoints and were responsible for providing input from their respective groups to manifest
134 ownership. These groups include the academic research team, ultrasound faculty, VA ED
135 leadership, and primary ED providers (end-users) and together comprise the co-creator team.

136 **Table 2: Inclusion and exclusion criteria for the VA POCUS intervention co-design sessions**

Included (n=total within the group)	Excluded
Research team (n=11)	ED nurses
Ultrasound faculty (n=2)	Intermediate Care Technicians (ICTs)
ED leadership (ED chief, Deputy Director, committee and education leads) (n=4)	Ancillary ED providers (14 moonlighting fellows)
Primary ED providers (24 attendings, 1 APP)	

137

138 **Table 3: List of stakeholder groups included as co-creators in the co-design process**

Group	Definition	Example	Expertise
Academic research team (n=4)	Individuals who conduct the research study	University researchers, study mentors	Research knowledge from prior experience, literature review, and mentorship
Ultrasound faculty (n=1)	Individuals who are interested in the implementation intervention and are experts on ultrasound education and clinical use	Ultrasound-trained ED physicians	Knowledge experts on ultrasound literature, POCUS education, and clinical POCUS system processes
VA ED leadership (n=3)	Administrative ED faculty who make decisions on behalf of the group, meet with other hospital groups for collaboration and cohesive medical care, and could potentially benefit from the intervention's success	ED Chief, Deputy Director, lead educational faculty	Provide insight on the intervention development and have experience with the ED and VA hospital system processes and resources, including personnel
ED providers (end-users) (n=4)	Group or individuals who are the target of the intervention and could potentially benefit from its success	Primary ED providers (ED attendings and APP)	Provide insight on specific group and individual needs

139 N=number of co-creator participants from each group

140

141 2.4 Co-design process: identifying co-design goals, topics, and relevant background information:

142 Using PRODUCES, the Problem was a need for a sustainable ED POCUS program and lack of a

143 standardized implementation system. The goal or Objective of the co-design meetings was to

144 develop 1) a curriculum of topics to be covered in educational sessions, and 2) optimal processes
145 for the clinical POCUS system (documentation, archiving, image review, equipment
146 maintenance, and quality improvement and program feedback). Ultrasound faculty and the
147 research team performed a literature review to understand what types of POCUS education or
148 clinical interventions had been implemented at other sites, their effectiveness, and evaluation
149 process.

150 2.5 Structure of the co-design sessions (Figure 1):

151 We convened in four monthly co-design meetings from July to October 2021 to analyze and
152 provide direct feedback on further improving our POCUS intervention components (Design).
153 Each individual's expertise (Co-creators) was elicited to maximize the impact of our
154 intervention's development and sustainability. For example, ultrasound faculty researched and
155 proposed educational material for the teaching curriculum through review of published
156 ultrasound studies and validated curriculums. They then tailored topics toward knowledge and
157 skills gaps identified by End-users, who were represented by the co-creators. Session formats,
158 timing, group sizes, and other details were modified based on input from VA ED leadership and
159 education leads.

160 **Figure 1: VA POCUS program Co-design Process and Timeline**

- 161 1. **Initial orientation and co-design planning meeting #1:** For our POCUS intervention and
162 strategic implementation, we first framed the problem by holding an initial co-design
163 orientation meeting to define and discuss key stakeholder requirements amongst the co-
164 creator groups. We oriented co-creators to the study and the proposed POCUS
165 implementation intervention and plan, strategized methods for deployment and information

166 dissemination, and planned the initial designs of the educational and clinical program
167 components.

168
169 For POCUS education, we outlined a longitudinal POCUS curriculum involving both
170 hands-on education and online/textbook ultrasound resources. We proposed offering an
171 introductory basic skills POCUS course and smaller monthly hands-on POCUS sessions,
172 with ultrasound faculty and skilled POCUS users as instructors. Next, we planned what
173 specific educational content to include and mapped out the course structure.

174
175 For the clinical POCUS systems intervention, ultrasound faculty and ED leadership worked
176 together to lay out a framework for required components including ultrasound
177 documentation, archiving, and image review. ED leadership assisted in identifying
178 appropriate contacts from other departments including BioMedical and support staff to
179 understand how to implement a program within our ED specifically (e.g. internet
180 connections and network capabilities, setting up an ultrasound procedure order in the
181 electronic health record (EHR), POCUS exam template notes, etc.).

182
183 **2. Co-design meetings #2-4:** Three additional co-design meetings were held monthly via
184 secured video conferencing and lasted approximately one hour, incorporating member
185 checking and respondent validation. The co-design meetings were structured to focus on
186 refining 1) the educational POCUS component, 2) the clinical POCUS component, and 3)
187 finalization of both components, but also intentionally included topic overlap for cyclical
188 improvement. For each meeting, we summarized prior work, recapped the project status,

189 allowed for open discussion and new ideas in a safe, protected space, time for reflection
190 and feedback on processes that were going well or poorly, and reiterated key points and
191 future tasks or goals at the meeting's conclusion (Evaluation).

192
193 To start each meeting, the overall aim and session's purpose were highlighted. End-users
194 were up-skilled or given an overview of co-design methodology and required POCUS
195 system components. Ultrasound faculty and the research team were up-skilled regarding
196 ED providers' preferences and reasons for using or not using POCUS, ways to address use
197 barriers, and opportunities to facilitate POCUS use. Together, we reviewed intervention
198 components that had been implemented since the last meeting, offered suggestions for
199 improvement, outlined upcoming intervention components for the next month, and
200 summarized the discussion. Each proposed idea was openly discussed with the entire co-
201 creator group present, refined, and adapted based on input. Disagreements were decided
202 upon by a majority vote. Finally, we created an evaluation and feedback plan to assess our
203 co-design and implementation process. Updates would be shared with all ED providers at
204 monthly faculty meetings and disseminated via email for feedback (Evaluation).

205
206 **3. Data gathering process for program evaluation and feedback:** Throughout our co-
207 design process, we used modified grounded theory and iterative analysis of data collected
208 at each co-design meeting for frequent refinement of our intervention design and
209 implementation process. Co-creators reviewed summarized data from pre-course
210 questionnaires, interview responses, and EHR data regarding POCUS use in the current
211 healthcare system to promote brainstorming, reflection, and new ideas to improve the

212 educational and clinical POCUS intervention and implementation strategy. Furthermore,
213 ultrasound faculty met with POCUS users from other departments (e.g. Hospital Medicine,
214 Anesthesiology/Intensive Care, and Pain Medicine) to understand how they were using
215 POCUS clinically, identify system problems and gaps, and collaborate on establishing a
216 hospital-wide POCUS archiving system and faculty credentialing process (Scalability).

217 **III. Results:**

218 For the co-design meetings, we had good representation from all co-creator groups (3 researchers,
219 1 ultrasound faculty, 3 ED leadership, and 5 ED provider representatives) for a total sample size
220 of 12 participants (Table 3). These individuals served as co-creators throughout the co-design
221 process. Eleven participants were emergency medicine-trained (EM) physicians, 1 was an internal
222 medicine-trained (IM) physician, and ages ranged from 31-65 years old (Table 3). The co-creator
223 retention rate for meeting attendance and frequently contributing to sessions throughout the co-
224 design process was 100%.

225 **Outcomes of the co-design sessions:**

226 Seven major topics with multiple discussion points emerged from our co-design sessions
227 regarding the proposed one-year education and clinical POCUS system intervention and
228 implementation plan (November 2021 to October 2022) (Table 4). We describe these outcomes
229 by session.

230 **Table 4: Topics and discussion points identified during co-design meetings with ED clinical**
231 **providers (co-creators)**

232 Topics from the project proposal discussed in meetings	233 Topic discussion points identified by ED clinical staff in meetings
234 A. POCUS education (knowledge and skills)	235 -What are the gaps in current POCUS knowledge and use at the VA ED?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -How do we train a group with diverse baseline POCUS knowledge/skills (e.g. no prior training, beginner, skilled in some exams, advanced user)? -How do we define the logistics for POCUS education sessions (number of sessions, teaching format, group sizes, frequency, etc.)? -What are the facilitators for knowledge retention and what POCUS resources can we suggest? -What are end-users' preferences for included content (e.g. diagnostic and procedural POCUS exams)?
B. Increasing uptake of clinical POCUS use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -How can POCUS use be increased at the VA ED? -How can radiology US use be reduced (especially on nights/weekends when US technician is not in house)? -How can patient outcomes and ED times be improved? -What are the perceived barriers and facilitators to POCUS use in current practice?
C. POCUS documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What is our current POCUS process? -What is the best method to save POCUS images/clips? -How should we document findings in the patient chart? -How can we create a simple, standardized clinical POCUS process?
D. POCUS archiving	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What are the pros/cons of a systemwide vs departmental POCUS archiving system? -What are current barriers to saving POCUS images? -How do other departments perform POCUS (best practices)?
E. POCUS image review and feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What are ED providers' comfort with performing/teaching POCUS? -How do we create a system of checks and balances? -How do we define ultrasound faculty support and responsibilities for image review/feedback (e.g. feedback methods, schedule, and frequency)?
F. US equipment maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Who uses the ED US machines? -What is our storage, cleaning, location, and stocking process? -How do we address problems with out-of-service machines? -How do we share machines amongst users (availability)?
G. POCUS program quality improvement and feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -How do we evaluate our POCUS intervention and success/failures of our implementation process? -How do we achieve continuous reinforcement methods through positive peer feedback? -How do we maximize support from ED leadership and ED clinical POCUS champions to promote POCUS use and establish a sustainable intervention? -What are the best methods for results dissemination to ED providers, ED and hospital leadership, and outside POCUS users for collaboration and future improvements?

232

233 **1. Initial orientation and co-design planning meeting outcomes:**

234 All co-creators met to develop a co-designed curriculum of 1) topics to be covered in educational
235 sessions and 2) optimal clinical POCUS system processes (Table 3).

236 a) POCUS education: ED ultrasound faculty with POCUS training expertise recommended
237 holding an introductory comprehensive in-person ultrasound training session. VA hospital
238 medicine POCUS faculty had shared with ultrasound faculty the effectiveness of their in-person
239 similar teaching format, which was encouraging. ED providers (end-users) were excited about
240 hands-on training in a group environment to incorporate our ED providers' wide spectrum of
241 POCUS skills (from no training to beginner to advanced) and elicit active participation from
242 many ED providers.

243 Session format: Together, co-creators brainstormed best times to offer an introductory POCUS
244 training session with rotating hands-on stations to maximize ED provider participation and active
245 learning, with moonlighting fellows scheduled to work in the ED that day. ED ultrasound faculty
246 also proposed leading small-group monthly in-person scanning sessions to reinforce learning and
247 longitudinal knowledge retention, and ED providers agreed that this repetitive time-spaced
248 learning would be high-yield.

249 Content: Study researchers asked for content input from the individual end-users (ED providers)
250 who would be participating in the sessions (e.g. high-yield topics, clinically useful ED exams,
251 ultrasound-guided procedure requests, etc.) End-users requested reviewing core emergency
252 ultrasound diagnostic and procedural exams. Finally, for POCUS resources, ED educational lead

253 faculty suggested offering online preparatory and longitudinal learning by subscribing to a self-
254 directed comprehensive online program with videos and questions.

255 b) POCUS clinical system and data gathered: Ultrasound faculty and ED leadership met with
256 other VA hospital POCUS users to understand current POCUS processes. They reported that
257 POCUS use was minimal, lacked a standardized process, and an official archiving system.
258 Hospital Medicine users performed educational scans with individuals in small groups and
259 shared their in-person training session outline. Anesthesiology/intensive care users were
260 performing cardiac and lung POCUS scans but also did not have a documentation method and
261 were reporting findings in clinical notes. No archiving or faculty credentialing system was in
262 place in any department except in Pain Medicine solely for procedural guidance. We met with
263 BioMedical and technical support staff to set up an ED documentation process through our EHR
264 and had network ports built in the ED but were not successful in integrating US machine network
265 connections with the EHR for a centralized archiving system.

266 Thus, given these VA hospital system difficulties, ED ultrasound faculty proposed storing
267 clinical POCUS images on US machines and reviewing them weekly, providing quality
268 assurance feedback via secured email. ED providers and leadership agreed this would be the best
269 and simplest feedback method. Additional clinical process updates and information would be
270 disseminated via faculty meeting and secured email. Per ED leadership recommendations, the
271 finalized protocols for image documentation, archiving, and POCUS reference documents would
272 be distributed via email and maintained on a secured VA server. Finally, on-going VA hospital
273 wide discussions and negotiations to establish a hospital-wide POCUS archiving system would
274 continue in parallel.

275 c) POCUS program evaluation and feedback: Co-creators jointly decided that we would obtain
276 both individual and group feedback via monthly faculty meeting, emails, and in-person
277 discussions between the co-creators for continuous improvement throughout the intervention and
278 implementation process. In addition to pertinent POCUS and radiology ultrasound EHR data,
279 study researchers would prototype and pilot pre/post-course questionnaires and interviews
280 assessing ED providers' POCUS skills/comfort and to obtain program feedback. Finally, ED
281 leadership recommended using the same existing strategy for important intervention information
282 dissemination--briefing ED providers about the upcoming POCUS course and clinical POCUS
283 process changes via emails and at monthly ED provider meetings--to maximize acceptability and
284 awareness.

285 **Co-design meeting #2**: This meeting focused on developing and solidifying the educational
286 POCUS plan. Identified topics are discussed below.

287 Topic A. POCUS educational course and knowledge retention: ED providers reported a strong
288 desire for POCUS education.[6-8] End-users had many positive suggestions for molding the
289 teaching sessions. They believed that tailoring educational interventions to the individual ED
290 provider's needs would facilitate POCUS use, with repetitive sessions over a longitudinal
291 timeline for reinforcement. They preferred hands-on sessions, small-group over large-group, real
292 patients with pathology for advanced users, simulation models for beginners, and quick five-
293 minute ultrasound topics during monthly faculty meetings. All co-creators agreed that identifying
294 and incorporating these suggestions would be key in achieving high participation rates and end-
295 user buy-in to make our POCUS intervention an accepted and effective model.

296 Ultrasound faculty, lead educational faculty, and ED providers described POCUS as standard-of-
297 care and a critical topic in resident education, citing prior ultrasound studies from the

298 literature.[21,22] Thus, ED providers requested hands-on training time, especially for procedures
299 such as peripheral intravenous access (US-PIV), central lines, paracentesis, and common
300 diagnostic uses (such as cardiac, lung, fluid status, soft tissue, and musculoskeletal) in the
301 training and educational sessions. By tailoring sessions to individuals' needs, co-creators
302 perceived that we would maximize POCUS uptake with sustained co-creator engagement
303 throughout the intervention.

304 **Co-design meeting #3:** This meeting focused on solidifying the clinical POCUS plan. Identified
305 topics are discussed below.

306 Topic B. Increasing uptake of clinical POCUS use: Co-creators (ED providers) identified a need
307 for a convenient and efficient clinical POCUS system with few steps involved because they
308 perceived time constraints and system complexity as POCUS use barriers. ED providers reported
309 bedside POCUS could improve patient care and ED flow, especially during non-business hours
310 when the ultrasound technician is not on site.

311 Topic C. POCUS documentation: ED providers agreed with ultrasound faculty that a
312 standardized POCUS documentation process was needed. Some providers were not familiar with
313 how to save images on the ultrasound machines and wanted additional training on our site's
314 specific ED machines. All parties agreed on the need for a simple and clear documentation
315 process that would not impede workflow or create additional burdens.

316 Topic D. POCUS archiving: Together with ultrasound faculty, end-users desired increased
317 POCUS use and decreased radiology ultrasounds, but they did not have a good solution for
318 image archival/documentation, and many felt uncomfortable relying on POCUS scans alone to
319 make clinical decisions.

320 Topic E. POCUS image review and feedback: ED providers requested a formal image review
321 process by ultrasound faculty for all clinical ED-performed POCUS scans and a quality
322 improvement and feedback process. Ultrasound faculty introduced the concept of weekly ED
323 POCUS image review and the importance of saving and properly labeling images for improved
324 patient care and interpretation by reviewers, as is standard-of-care at other EDs. Ultrasound
325 faculty also offered in-person feedback while on shift to improve both ED provider image
326 acquisition and interpretation skills.

327 Topic F. Ultrasound equipment and maintenance: All co-creators agreed in replicating prior
328 standardized processes to reduce cognitive load, keep systems simple, and streamline steps for
329 POCUS use. For example, VA ED leadership and support staff would decide on ultrasound
330 machine location by docking station outlets, space availability, and ease of access. ED nursing
331 leadership and the ED Chief assisted with decisions on equipment stocking both with the machines
332 and the ED stockroom given they made those decisions for ED equipment procurement, storage,
333 and cleaning procedures.

334 **3. Proposed evaluation and feedback process outcomes:**

335 Topic G. POCUS program quality improvement, sustainability, and feedback: ED leadership,
336 lead educational faculty, and VA ED providers believed that information dissemination would
337 reach the largest number of ED providers via monthly faculty meeting as a secured space for
338 important group information, with reinforcement of material through short written email
339 reminders. Together, the co-creator group also decided which information would be important to
340 disseminate, and final approval was given by the VA ED chief. ED providers believed that
341 monthly POCUS initiative updates and reminders would elicit frequent feedback and
342 improvements based on participant input, enforcing program sustainability.

343 **Co-design meeting #4: Refining the multifaceted POCUS intervention through co-design and**
 344 **final design:**

345 Our final educational and clinical POCUS systems intervention is the collaborative product of our
 346 four co-design meetings, and the components are outlined in Supplementary Table 1. Preliminary
 347 outcome data and estimated program costs are presented in Table 5 and suggest successful program
 348 implementation, with a four-fold increase in clinical POCUS performance (72-->267 scans,
 349 $p < 0.001$) and unchanged radiology ultrasounds (355-->361 scans, $p = 0.417$) in the six months
 350 pre/post-intervention.

351 **Table 5: Preliminary POCUS program outcomes and estimated program costs**

Outcome Measures	Preliminary data
POCUS educational and clinical program participants (Nov 2021 to Oct 2022)	20/25 primary ED attendings/APPs (80%)
Clinical POCUS performed in the six months pre- to post-intervention	72 POCUS pre-intervention 267 POCUS post-intervention ($p < 0.001$)
Radiology US performed in the six months pre- to post-intervention	355 radiology US pre-intervention 361 radiology US post-intervention ($p = 0.417$)
Proportion of ED patients undergoing POCUS pre- to post-intervention (%)	26 POCUS (0.42%), n=6206 patients (Quarter 1) 189 POCUS (2.95%), n=6416 (Quarter 4) ($p < 0.001$)
<u>Estimated</u> POCUS program costs and components	-Four one-hour co-design meetings (“labor cost” for nine ED faculty participants) \$6000 -Ultrasound Faculty: 0.25 FTE for 12 months (program design, teaching monthly ultrasound sessions, weekly ED POCUS quality image review, etc.) -Ultrasound large-group teaching session for 20-25 participants (course facilitators, standardized patients, ultrasound supplies, facility fee) \$15,000 -Ultrasound equipment (two cart-based diagnostic machines, one vascular access machine) \$100,000 -Ultrasound archiving (software license, implementation, and 5-year maintenance costs) \$10,000-\$100,000 for local vs systemwide licensing

352

353 **V. Discussion**

354 Collaboration between co-creators in co-designing the intervention and implementation strategy
355 through an iterative process allowed ED providers to help select the POCUS content taught,
356 educational training session structure, and finalized steps required for the clinical POCUS
357 system. Like Bird’s study that involved close collaboration between healthcare providers and
358 family members to co-design, develop, and test a virtual care program for medically complex
359 children and family members to better integrate healthcare at home, we structured our co-design
360 process using PAR and EBCD methodology to streamline communication and care processes
361 amongst team members (Figure 1).[18]

362 We used Leask’s PRODUCES framework to identify POCUS implementation and use problems.
363 Preparatory planning steps with meetings between ultrasound faculty, ED leadership, other
364 hospital POCUS users, and BioMedical technical support staff were key. By understanding the
365 current POCUS system gaps and limitations and to underlie the foundations for our POCUS
366 intervention, we were able to present and brainstorm POCUS system solutions in our four co-
367 creator meetings to maximize user acceptability, uptake, and sustainability. The sequential
368 monthly co-design meetings created progressive user feedback for adaptation of educational
369 content and improving clinical POCUS workflow barriers and facilitators.[9]

370 By empowering members of the full co-design team, both VA ED leadership and ED providers
371 collaborate as a team to achieve the best outcomes for all parties involved.[27] Rather than a
372 one-time intervention, we created a co-designed longitudinal POCUS learning experience for ED
373 providers to achieve sustained POCUS knowledge and utilization. Other healthcare innovation
374 studies involving VA mental health patients and addressing problems with hospitalized veterans’

375 medications at transitions of care with processes similar to our study have been successful in
376 achieving sustainable solutions.[14,28,29] Moreover, the repetitive cyclical nature of PAR and
377 our co-designed process allows for adaptability and continuous growth and collaboration
378 between team members throughout the intervention, which strengthens relationships and helps
379 achieve sustainability. Our process compares with other VA studies using participatory design to
380 improve healthcare resource access for veterans by creating an integrated health information
381 technology system and web-based platform for veterans with mental health needs. Those studies
382 differ from ours in their outpatient setting with patients, rather than in-hospital with healthcare
383 providers for our study.[30-31] Other studies also support designating an ED clinical champion
384 and note the crucial role of leadership involvement in co-design to achieve program
385 success.[5,32] By involving co-creators throughout the design process, they feel that their views
386 are indispensable and are empowered, yielding intervention ownership and sustained
387 outcomes.[13,19]

388 To summarize, VA ED co-creators highlighted the importance of team communication,
389 collaboration, and adaptability to overcome educational POCUS system barriers and facilitate
390 clinical flow integration. We modeled our co-design process based on PAR and EBCD studies in
391 the literature that defined and refined an intervention, such as Hill's study co-designing an
392 interdisciplinary team-based intervention for initiating palliative care in pediatric oncology,
393 through four major co-design sessions. Their study differed from ours by creating three different
394 interventions to better suit their three pediatric oncology teams, and they contrastingly included
395 social workers and outside professional resources for interprofessional training.[16] Similarly,
396 Crowther used adapted EBCD principles to develop and refine an intervention to improve
397 guideline-adherent asthma care. The study differs by its primary and secondary care setting

398 involvement and inclusion of both healthcare staff and patients, whereas our study focused on
399 ED providers in a single VA ED and did not solicit patient input.[17] Like Hill's and Crowther's
400 studies, VA ED co-creators can capitalize on the malleability of our intervention and
401 implementation plan design by both anticipating potential problems and responding to
402 difficulties throughout the process.[16-17] Finally, the iterative PAR and EBCD cycles evaluate
403 the co-design process with continuous co-creator feedback.[9,15] The simple format of four co-
404 design sessions with clearly defined steps and data collection methods makes this a simple and
405 streamlined process for scalability and implementation at other sites.

406 Limitations: A single standardized co-design method for designing healthcare services or
407 products does not exist, and there are many possible frameworks and methodologies. We chose
408 and adapted existing frameworks that best fit our setting and goals, but a different methodology
409 may have yielded different results. Our convenience sampling method for recruitment may
410 introduce bias since providers interested in improvement processes may not represent the entire
411 group. To avoid bias, participation was completely voluntary, we invited ED providers of all
412 medical specialty training backgrounds and at varying levels of POCUS use and expertise, and
413 we ensured adequate representation from all co-creator groups at each co-design session.
414 Furthermore, there is not a clear way of evaluating co-design methods for their outcomes.
415 Finally, co-design can be context dependent, thus methods that work well in one context may not
416 work at another site.[10] Nevertheless, other studies demonstrate the importance of end-user and
417 stakeholder input in achieving an acceptable healthcare product or system process.[13,19]

418 Conclusion:

419 We describe a user-centered co-design process to maximize POCUS uptake, sustainability, and
420 use retention in the implementation of our POCUS program and systems intervention at a single
421 VA ED. The co-design methods described are straightforward, generalizable, and can be used as
422 a standard framework for future POCUS program implementation and dissemination.

423

424

425

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438 **References:**

- 439 1. American College of Emergency Physicians. ACEP guidelines Policy Statement. Ultrasound
440 guidelines: Emergency, Point-of-care, and clinical ultrasound guidelines in medicine. Revised
441 April 2023. [https://www.acep.org/siteassets/new-pdfs/policy-statements/ultrasound-guidelines--
442 emergency-point-of-care-and-clinical-ultrasound-guidelines-in-medicine.pdf](https://www.acep.org/siteassets/new-pdfs/policy-statements/ultrasound-guidelines--emergency-point-of-care-and-clinical-ultrasound-guidelines-in-medicine.pdf). Accessed 15 June
443 2023.
- 444 2. Moore CL, Molina AA, Lin H. Ultrasonography in community emergency departments in the
445 United States: access to ultrasonography performed by consultants and status of emergency
446 physician-performed ultrasonography. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2006 Feb;47(2):147-53.
- 447 3. Lewiss RE, Pearl M, Nomura JT, et al. CORD-AEUS: consensus document for the emergency
448 ultrasound milestone project. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2013;20(7):740-5.
- 449 4. Amini R, Wyman MT, Hernandez NC, et al. Use of emergency ultrasound in Arizona
450 community emergency departments. *J Ultrasound Med*. 2017;36(5):913–21.
- 451 5. Boyd JS, LoPresti CM, et al. Current use and training needs of point-of-care ultrasound in
452 emergency departments: A national survey of VA hospitals. *Am J Emerg Med*. 2019
453 Sep;37(9):1794-1797.
- 454 6. Resop DM, Basrai Z, Boyd JS, et al. Current use, training, and barriers in point-of-care
455 ultrasound in emergency departments in 2020: A National Survey of VA hospitals. *Am J Emerg
456 Med*. 2023 Jan;63:142-146.
- 457 7. Remskar MH, Theophanous R, Bowman A, et al. Current Use, Training, and Barriers of Point-
458 of-Care Ultrasound in Anesthesiology: A National Survey of Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *J
459 Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth*. 2023 Aug;37(8):1390-1396.

- 460 8. Sanders JL, Noble VE, Raja AS, et al. Access to and use of point-of-care ultrasound in the
461 emergency department. *West J Emerg Med.* 2015;16(5):747-52.
- 462 9. Leask CF, Sandlund M, Skelton DA, et al. Framework, principles and recommendations for
463 utilising participatory methodologies in the co-creation and evaluation of public health
464 interventions. *Res Involv Engagem.* 2019 Jan 9;5:2.
- 465 10. Redman, S, Greenhalgh, T, Adedokun, L, et al. Co-production of Knowledge Collection
466 Steering Committee. Co-production of knowledge: the future. *BMJ.* 2021; 372.
- 467 11. U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs. Veterans Health Administration. About VHA.
468 <https://www.va.gov/health/aboutvha.asp#:~:text=The%20Veterans%20Health%20Administratio>
469 [n%20\(VHA,Veterans%20enrolled%20in%20the%20VA.](https://www.va.gov/health/aboutvha.asp#:~:text=The%20Veterans%20Health%20Administratio) Accessed June 15, 2023.
- 470 12. Slattery P, Saeri AK, Bragge P. Research co-design in health: a rapid overview of reviews.
471 *Health Res Policy Syst.* 2020 Feb 11;18(1):17.
- 472 13. Iniesto F, Charitonos K, Littlejohn A. A review of research with co-design methods in health
473 education. *Open Educ Stud.* 2022; 4(1):273-295.
- 474 14. Raynor DK, Ismail H, Blenkinsopp A, et al. Experience-based co-design-Adapting the
475 method for a researcher-initiated study in a multi-site setting. *Health Expect.* 2020
476 Jun;23(3):562-570.
- 477 15. Hickey G, Brearley S, Coldham T, et al. Guidance on co-producing a research project.
478 Southampton: *INVOLVE.* 2018.
- 479 16. Hill DL, Walter JK, Casas JA, et al. The codesign of an interdisciplinary team-based
480 intervention regarding initiating palliative care in pediatric oncology. *Support Care Cancer.*
481 2018 Sep;26(9):3249-3256.

- 482 17. Crowther L, Pearson M, Cummings H, et al. Towards codesign in respiratory care:
483 development of an implementation-ready intervention to improve guideline-adherent adult
484 asthma care across primary and secondary care settings (The SENTINEL Project). *BMJ Open*
485 *Respir Res.* 2022 Feb;9(1):e001155.
- 486 18. Bird, M, McGillion, M, Chambers, EM, et al. A generative co-design framework for
487 healthcare innovation: development and application of an end-user engagement framework. *Res*
488 *Involv Engagem.* 2021;7(12).
- 489 19. Mohan H, Nandan K, Mohan R, et al. Case Study on co-design methodology for improved
490 cook stove solutions for rural community in India. 2019 IEEE Region 10 Humanitarian
491 Technology Conference. Depok, Indonesia, Nov 12-14, 2019.
- 492 20. Staniszewska S, Brett J, Simera I, et al. GRIPP2 reporting checklists: tools to improve
493 reporting of patient and public involvement in research. *BMJ.* 2017;358:j3453.
- 494 21. Schnikkte N, Damewood S. Identifying and Overcoming Barriers to Resident Use of Point-
495 of-Care Ultrasound. *West J Emerg Med.* 2019 Oct 14;20(6):918-925.
- 496 22. Choi YJ, Jung JY, Kwon H. Effectiveness of ultrasound education in point-of-care
497 ultrasound-assisted physical examinations in an emergency department: a before-and-after study.
498 *Medicine.* 2017;96:25(e7269).
- 499 23. Schott CK, LoPresti CM, Boyd JS, et al. Retention of Point-of-Care Ultrasound Skills
500 Among Practicing Physicians: Findings of the VA National POCUS Training Program. *Am J*
501 *Med.* 2021 Mar;134(3):391399.e8.

- 502 24. Blans MJ, Pijl MEJ, Van de Water JM, et al. The implementation of POCUS and POCUS
503 training for residents: the Rinjstate approach. *Neth J Med*. 2020 Apr;78(3):116-124.
- 504 25. Brant JA, Orsborn J, Good R, et al. Evaluating a longitudinal point-of-care ultrasound
505 (POCUS) curriculum for pediatric residents. *BMC Med Educ*. 2021;21:64.
- 506 26. Butki N, Long J, Butki A, et al. A Novel “Train the Trainer” emergency medicine resident
507 point-of-care ultrasound course: a feasibility study. *SMRj*. 2020;4(2).
- 508 27. Trischler J, Pervan S, Kelly S, et al. The value of codesign: the effect of customer
509 involvement in service design teams. *Journal of Service Research*. 2018;2(1)75-100.
- 510 28. Palmer VJ, Weavell W, Callander R, et al. The Participatory Zeigeist: an explanatory
511 theoretical model of change in an era of coproduction and codesign in healthcare improvement.
512 *Med Humanit*. 2019;45:247257.
- 513 29. Bate P, Robert G. Experience-based design: redesigning the system around the patient to co-
514 designing services with the patient. *Qual Saf Health Care*. 2006;15:307-310.
- 515 30. Haun JN, Nazi KM, Chavez M, et al. A participatory approach to designing and enhancing
516 integrated health information technology systems for veterans: protocol. *JMIR Res Protoc*. 2015
517 Feb 27;4(1):e28.
- 518 31. LaMonica HM, Davenport TA, Burns J, et al. Technology-Enabled Mental Health Service
519 Reform for Open Arms - Veterans and Families Counselling: Participatory Design Study. *JMIR*
520 *Form Res*. 2019 Sep 19;3(3):e13662.

521 32. Flanagan ME, Plue L, Miller KK, et al. A qualitative study of clinical champions in context:
522 Clinical champions across three levels of acute care. *SAGE Open Med.* 2018 Aug
523 1;6:2050312118792426.

524

525 **Figure captions:**

526 Figure 1: VA POCUS program Co-design Process and Timeline

527 Supplementary Table 1: Final proposed POCUS intervention and implementation strategy

