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Background: High fidelity simulation (HFS) has been described as an effective tool in medical training. COVID-19 has led to educational gathering restrictions for both medical students (MS) and Physician Assistant students (PAS). In response, we offered MS and PAS education through a virtual HFS (VS) experience.

Study Objective: To determine the perceived educational efficacy of VS.

Methods: This IRB reviewed study was conducted by a PGY-1-4 EM residency. Given COVID restrictions, virtual clerkship educational experiences, including VS were created. VS was conducted via WebEX TM. Previous in person HFS cases were streamed by on site personnel, including faculty and chief residents Student leaders were assisted by teammates via chat in teams of 3. Students had a minimum of 3 VS. After rotation completion, either full virtual (FV) or patient care with virtual education (PC), MS and PAS were asked to provide anonymous feedback. The electronic survey consisted of the host network’s standard Continuing Medical Education (CME) questions (Table 1). The Likert questions were analyzed descriptively with a value of 1 for Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 Disagree (D), 3 Undecided (U), 4 Agree (A), and 5 Strongly Agree (SA). Open ended questions were qualitatively analyzed.

Results: From 8/3/20-10/23/20, 79 students (58 FV, 19 PC) rotated. Due to scheduling conflicts, 14 were unable to participate leaving 65 VS participants (44 FV, 21 PC). A total of 46 replied (70.8% response rate). Table 1 demonstrates that VS was received overwhelmingly positively. Only 1 respondent replied that they would not recommend this activity to others. Positives include perceived realism, experience, and teamwork. Ability to view the monitor was a theme for improvement.

Conclusions: This single site cohort indicates that VS is an effective, well received education tool for students unable to access a sim center. Further research is needed to compare VS to an in-person simulation experience.

Table 1: CME Questions and Analysed Response

| Question                                                                 | Analyzed Response |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| The objectives of this activity were met                                  | 4.71 (50.5, 5, 19, 13, 33) A |
| The pacing of the activity was appropriate                               | 5.59 (50, 5, 19, 17, 38) A |
| The activity kept me engaged                                             | 4.76 (50, 5, 19, 19, 30) A |
| I learned new knowledge from this activity                               | 4.85 (50, 5, 19, 17, 39) A |
| I will be able to apply what I have learned to my job                    | 4.35 (50, 5, 19, 19, 24) A |
| This activity will improve my job performance and productivity            | 4.59 (50, 5, 19, 17, 35) A |

What about this activity was most useful to you?
Several students commented on the usefulness of acting as a leader and playing the role of a physician, as well as the feedback and review provided at conclusion of the cases. They also appreciated the realistic environment and scenarios that were created. In addition, students enjoyed being put in stressful situations and working as a team to put their knowledge into practice. Others commented on the extra experience and practice that is provided.

What about this activity was least useful to you?
Common responses included N/A, difficulties seeing the patient monitor and inherent difficulties with the virtual process (lack of actual patient touch/ inability to perform a physical exam, logging of computer quality, etc) and the procedure demonstrations.

How can we improve this activity to make it more relevant?
Many responses indicated N/A, having physician needs perform an example case, improve clarity of monitors/ EKGs/ imaging presented over the web cam. One student mentioned adding metrics for team members in addition to the team leader, more structured debriefing.

Please provide any additional comments you may have.
(e.g., speakers, content, facilities, cases, etc.)
Common responses included thanking the team for putting together the activity, suggesting making the monitor more clearly visible.

What are you going to change in your practice as a result of this educational activity?
Major themes included students having a more structured approach, including utilization of a safety net (IV, O2, Monitor, POC glucose, urine HCG) and assessment of ABCs. Second, students expressed they would be more careful to maintain a broad differential rather than “anchoring” on a single diagnosis. Additionally, students reported they would strive to share their thoughts with the rest of the team throughout a patient’s course of treatment and they would remember to utilize family and EMS for history that may be useful to the patient’s diagnosis and treatment.

State any barriers to implementing this change.
Most responses were N/A, but also included feedback of computer/ virtual aspects and inability to see but limited patients in their current level of training.
supplemental oxygen in the ED. 12.7% of COVID positive patients were positive for PE compared to 8.3% for COVID negative. The d-dimer institutional cut-off of 0.5 mg/L was sensitive for PE on CT without false negative results. There was a significant age difference between hypoxic patients (median age of 63) and non-hypoxic patients (median age of 50). A Sankey diagram of COVID positive patients who had both contrast-enhanced CTs performed and D-dimers drawn is presented as a figure.

Conclusion: Non-hypoxic COVID positive patients had a largely comparable positivity rate of PE on contrast enhanced CT imaging compared to non-hypoxic non-COVID patients, but in the subset of patients who received supplemental oxygen, COVID patients were at considerably increased risk of PE. Using the conventional cut-off value of D-dimers yielded no false negative results, however D-dimer values frequently were obtained as part of a routine COVID workup for risk stratification.

Our study was limited by its single center design. Further research is needed to determine if COVID positive patients have an increased risk of pulmonary embolism.

Study Objectives: Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and COVID-19: its associated disease in humans appears to cause more severe morbidity and mortality in older adults and geriatric patients than in children and young adults. There is growing recognition of the association between both race and obesity and disease severity in hospitalized patients with COVID-19. However, the impact of age, race, and other major comorbidities on COVID-19 course in children and younger adults is not as well understood.

Methods: We conducted a retrospective analysis of 2656 patients under the age of 36 years with COVID-19 between March 1, 2020 and August 6, 2020 as reported to HEALTHITLink, a regional health information system for western New York State. Subjects were split into pediatric (0-19 years) and young adult (20-36 years) datasets. We evaluated the association between candidate risk factors (age, sex, race, calculated BMI/BMI percentile, smoking status, diabetes, pre-existing respiratory disease, hypertension, and sickle cell disease) using recursive partitioning and linear regression. The primary outcome was hospital admission, with length of stay being the secondary outcome.

Results: There were 2129 young adults and 527 pediatric patients who tested positive for COVID-19 during our study period. In our young adult population, race was the most significant predictor of admission, followed by BMI. African American race was associated with a BMI < 23 had the highest rate of admission (66%, p<0.001). Interestingly, Asian race was a strong predictor of outpatient management, regardless of BMI. Smoking status and hypertension were less significant predictors of admission, whereas sex, diabetes, preexisting respiratory conditions, and sickle cell disease were not significant. For our pediatric population, race was also the most significant predictor of admission, with African Americans being admitted at higher rates than Whites and Asians. In the pediatric population, however, BMI percentile for age was not a predictor of admission. In regards to the secondary outcome, admitted young adult with COVID-19 had an average length of stay of 1.4 days (SD ±2) while the admitted pediatric COVID-19 patients had an average length of stay of 1 day (SD ±1.1). African American race was associated with longer length of stay in both populations however, BMI was only significant in the young adult population.

Conclusions: In a regional population of young adult and pediatric patients with COVID-19, race was strongly predictive of admission and length of stay. African American patients were most likely to be admitted, while Asian race was a strong predictor of outpatient management. For African American young adults, a BMI > 23 was the strongest additional predictor of admission. For younger patients with COVID-19 a simple decision tree that incorporates age, race, and BMI can help identify those patients least likely to need inpatient management.

Study Objectives: Multiple reports in the US and worldwide demonstrate substantial decreases in ED utilization for serious conditions during the early surge mitigation phase of the COVID-19 crisis. In Ohio, governmental surge mitigation measures were instituted very early, beginning March 3, 2020, prior to its first reported case. Importantly, these recommendations prompted multiple hospital system wide initiatives to prevent “unnecessary” COVID and non-COVID ED and hospital utilization. However, these strategies may have decreased ED visits for more emergent conditions, causing underutilization of needed resources by high-risk ED populations. Opioid overdose (OD) is a leading cause of accidental death in the US and the effect of early surge mitigation on the population at high risk for opioid overdose death is unknown. The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of early COVID-19 mitigation measures on ED visits for patients at high risk for opioid overdose.

Methods: This study was performed in a major urban Midwest hospital system with IRB approval. We previously created an algorithm using the electronic health record (EHR, Epic systems) to identify patients presenting to the ED with a high risk of a subsequent opioid. The number of patients from March 1, 2020 to June 30, 2020 (COVID-19 mitigation phase) were compared to patients presenting from March 1, 2019 to June 30, 2019. Total ED visits during that time were also determined. Statistical comparison was by Fisher’s exact test.

Results: There were 31,809 ED visits during the COVID-19 mitigation phase compared to 44,297 in 2019, a 29% decrease. We identified 188 patients at high risk for subsequent opioid OD during the COVID-19 mitigation phase compared to 206 during the control period. This represents a significant increase in the percentage of ED visits by high-risk patients for subsequent opioid OD during the COVID-19 mitigation phase (0.59% of ED visits vs. 0.46% of ED visits, p=0.018).

Conclusion: The number of patients presenting to the ED at high risk for subsequent opioid OD was not affected by the COVID-19 mitigation measures, resulting in a relative increase in the percentage of high-risk patients seen during that time. Future determination of the effect of surge mitigation strategies on linkage to care and treatment resources available during that time will be important to develop strategies to ensure appropriate resources are in place for these high-risk patients for future pandemic preparedness.