



DEPARTMENT OF ANAESTHESIA
& PERIOPERATIVE MEDICINE
UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

Dissertation for Master of Medicine (MMED) in Anaesthesia

Perioperative ultrasound among South African anaesthetists: a survey of current practice and availability

MMed Candidate: Dr Mohammad Ishraque Shaukat Kathrada
Primary Investigator/Supervisor: Dr Matthew Winton Gibbs
Co-Investigators: Dr Marcelle Jagga
Dr Nosisi Mzoneli
Professor Justiaan Swanevelder

List of Documents Included

1. Declaration
2. Acknowledgements
3. Thesis
4. Publication in SAJAA
5. Ethics Approval Letter
6. Ethics Study Closure Report
7. Appendix 1- Initial Questionnaire (Pilot Survey)
8. Appendix 2- Final Questionnaire

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

DECLARATION

I, **MOHAMMAD ISHRAQUE SHAUKAT KATHRADA**, hereby declare that the work on which this dissertation/thesis is based is my original work (except where acknowledgements indicate otherwise) and that neither the whole work nor any part of it has been, is being, or is to be submitted for another degree in this or any other university.

I empower the university to reproduce for the purpose of research either the whole or any portion of the contents in any manner whatsoever.

Signed by candidate

Signature:

Date:12/12/2022.....

Acknowledgements

- Dr Matthew Gibbs (Supervisor)**
- Dr Marcelle Jagga (Co-Supervisor)**
- Dr Nosisi Mzoneli (Co-Supervisor)**
- Prof Justiaan Swanevelder (Co-Supervisor)**
- All participants who participated in the study**

Format : Published manuscript.

Study has been published in the Southern African Journal of Anaesthesia and Analgesia. 2021;27(6):271-277

<https://doi.org/10.36303/SAJAA.2021.27.6.2636>

Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons License [CC BY-NC 3.0]

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0>

Perioperative ultrasound among South African anaesthetists: a survey of current practice and availability

MIS Kathrada,¹ M Jagga,¹ YN Mzoneli,² J Swanevelder,¹ MW Gibbs¹

¹ *Department of Anaesthesia and Perioperative Medicine, University of Cape Town, South Africa*

² *Discipline of Anaesthesiology and Critical Care, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa*

Corresponding author, email: matthew.gibbs@uct.ac.za

Abstract

Background: Point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) is becoming part of the standard skill set of the modern-day anaesthetist. There is limited knowledge regarding the availability of ultrasound (US) and POCUS skills in South Africa. There may be barriers to adopting US in many institutions.

Methods: An observational cohort questionnaire was distributed via an online REDCap survey. All doctors practising anaesthesia in South Africa were eligible. Recruitment was done via an email link that was sent to South African Society of Anaesthesiologists (SASA) members. Non-SASA members were recruited via departmental mailing lists or social media.

Results: Of the 580 respondents, 478 were SASA members (response rate 22.9%, confidence interval 3.94) and 102 were non-SASA members. In total, 571 surveys were suitable for analysis, 397 (69.5%) respondents had more than five years anaesthesia experience, 558 (97.7%) of respondents worked in hospitals that have US machines available, and 76.7% had US readily available after hours. Respondents used US mostly for central venous catheter (CVC) insertions (77.9%), regional anaesthesia (82.3%), and cardiac and lung assessments (26.4% and 17.7%, respectively). It is used much less frequently for neuraxial anaesthesia (1.4%). Of the respondents, 382 (66.9%) had received US training, only 198 (34.7%) felt confident in their US skills, and 482 (84.4%) wish to have further US training. The two most significant barriers to US were lack of equipment and lack of training at postgraduate level.

Conclusion: South African anaesthetists work at institutions where US equipment is generally available, and most practitioners want to incorporate US in their practice. However, anaesthetists feel insecure with respect to their skills and indicated that they wish to receive further training. Efforts should be made to formalise POCUS training in the Fellowship of the College of Anaesthetists (FCA) curriculum and make US training more accessible.

Keywords: anaesthetists, point-of-care ultrasound, POCUS, FATE, ultrasound guidance, South Africa, training

Introduction

Point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) plays an important role in vascular access placement, regional nerve blocks, and heart and lung assessments in the perioperative period. Its use has been shown to reduce failure and complication rates thereby improving patient safety and procedural efficiency.¹ Ultrasound (US) use among anaesthesiologists has gained greater importance in postgraduate training. Specialist training milestones, such as those developed by the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) and the American Board of Anesthesiology (ABA), have incorporated US for nerve blocks, vascular access and certain pain procedures.²

Many international guidelines, including those issued by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) in the United Kingdom (UK) and the Canadian Anesthesiologists' Society (CAS), have recommended the routine use of US guidance when performing invasive procedures such as central venous cannulations.^{1,4} As per the 2018 guidelines of the South African Society of Anaesthesiologists (SASA), US is now considered as part of the basic skill set of an anaesthesiologist.³ The introduction of US technology has revolutionised the field of regional anaesthesia.³ Focused assessment using transthoracic echocardiography (FATE) is an invaluable perioperative extension to the clinical examination.³ Also, the use of US imaging aids with rapid diagnosis of severe and life-threatening pathological conditions, and may change clinical management and impact on patient outcome.^{5,6} In many international centres, US is included in the training of anaesthesiologists from the outset.³

In South Africa, however, there is limited knowledge as to the availability of ultrasound for POCUS and the skills necessary for training among anaesthetists. It is not clear what factors affect the uptake of POCUS in a resource-limited setting such as South Africa. The primary objective of this study was to determine how US is used perioperatively for vascular access placement, nerve blocks, and heart and lung assessments. The study also sought to identify training experiences, desire for further US training and preferences in modes of training from participants. Secondary objectives were to identify the barriers and limitations preventing US use among South African anaesthetists.

Methods

This study was conducted using a questionnaire which was made available in an online digital format. Approval was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Cape Town (HREC 397/2020) prior to distribution of the questionnaire.

This questionnaire that was used was adapted (with permission) from a similar survey conducted by Chui et al.¹ in 2018 in Southwestern Ontario. The questionnaire was modified to suit the South African context, with regards to participants characteristics mostly. It was validated by doing a pilot survey with a small sample of twelve anaesthetists who use POCUS. From the pilot survey, it was deemed necessary to add further questions to the questionnaire with the aim to get more details about the practice of Ultrasound.

The questionnaire was run for a 6-week period from 19 August 2020 to 2 October 2020. Participants were recruited via a link which was either sent by email to all SASA members, or distributed through a web-based link on anaesthesia departmental mailing lists and on social media WhatsApp groups. We limited reminders to weekly basis corresponding to the weekly SASA newsletters sent to its members over the 6-week period.

All anaesthesia practitioners from South Africa were eligible to participate. SASA members working in South Africa were especially approached for inclusion as they represent a feasible and reliable sample of all potential respondents that could be reached via the SASA membership database. Specialists, trainees and non-specialist anaesthetists were included. The survey was composed of 39 questions and was estimated to take approximately less than five minutes to complete. The questions were designed to address five main aspects: i) respondent characteristics, ii) institution characteristics, iii) individual practice, iv) training in US and US training preferences, and v) barriers and limitations to using US. Informed consent was obtained electronically prior to respondents participating in the survey.

Data were captured using REDCap, in collaboration with Safe Surgery SA and the Anaesthesia Network for South Africa (ANSA). The survey data were analysed using Microsoft Excel. Descriptive statistics, including mean, modes and percentages, were reported as appropriate to

assess the data. From the SASA membership, based on a confidence level of 95% and confidence interval of 5, the minimum sample size required was 324 (response rate 15.6%).

Results

Participants

Eligible participants for this study include doctors who currently practise anaesthesia in South Africa. This included specialists, registrars (trainee specialists) and non-specialists (medical officers and GP anaesthetists). At the time of the survey, there were 2 082 doctors on the SASA membership database currently practicing anaesthesia in South Africa. The total number of respondents was 580, of which 472 were SASA members. Nine surveys were incomplete and therefore discarded (Figure 1). With a sample size of 478 out of 2 082 SASA members (response rate 22.9%), the confidence interval is 3.94.




Figure 1: Analysed responses

The demographics of the respondents and the institutions at which they practice are summarised in Table I and Table II, respectively. Respondents were mostly between 30 and 49 years of age (70.9%). Most of the respondents were consultant anaesthetists (55.7%), 25.7% were registrars and 14.7% were medical officers. Only a small minority were GP anaesthetists (3.9%) and 4.4% had no anaesthesia qualifications. Almost all of the respondents were full-time anaesthetists (93.0%). Of the respondents, 58.8% worked in state hospitals, 32.4% in private hospitals and 8.8% worked in both. The majority of respondents work in the four most populated South African provinces, namely Western Cape (34.9%), Gauteng (25.7%), KwaZulu-Natal (20.3%) and Eastern Cape (8.4%). Detailed data about the respondents regarding their designation and the institutions where they work is available in Supplementary File 1.

Table I: Respondent data (N = 571)

| | <i>n</i> | [%] |
|------------------------|----------|--------|
| Gender | | |
| Male | 303 | [53.1] |
| Female | 265 | [46.4] |
| Prefer not to disclose | 3 | [0.5] |
| Age group | | |
| 20–29 | 41 | [7.2] |
| 30–39 | 266 | [46.6] |

| | | |
|------------------------------------------|-----|--------|
| 40–49 | 139 | [24.3] |
| 50–59 | 77 | [13.5] |
| 60–69 | 43 | [7.5] |
| > 69 | 5 | [0.9] |
| Designation | | |
| Medical officer | 84 | [14.7] |
| Registrar | 147 | [25.7] |
| Consultant | 318 | [55.7] |
| GP anaesthetist | 22 | [3.9] |
| Highest anaesthesia qualification | | |
| None | 25 | [4.4] |
| DA* | 224 | [39.2] |
| FCA * (or equivalent) | 305 | [53.4] |
| Subspecialists | 17 | [3.0] |
| Full-time practice | 531 | [93.0] |
| Part-time practice | 40 | [7.0] |
| State practice | 336 | [58.8] |
| Private practice | 185 | [32.4] |
| Both | 50 | [8.8] |
| Province of practice | | |
| Eastern Cape | 48 | [8.4] |
| Free State | 30 | [5.3] |
| Gauteng | 147 | [25.7] |
| KwaZulu-Natal | 116 | [20.3] |
| Limpopo | 2 | [0.4] |
| Mpumalanga | 9 | [1.6] |
| Northern Cape | 14 | [2.5] |
| North-West | 6 | [1.1] |
| Western Cape | 199 | [34.9] |

*DA – Diploma in Anaesthesia; FCA – Fellow of College of Anaesthetists

Institutional characteristics

Of the respondents, 77.7% worked mostly at tertiary level hospitals, 29.9 % at regional and the remaining 9.8% at district hospitals. Respondents predominantly worked at either large (≥ 10 operating rooms; 53.9%) or medium (4 to 10 operating rooms; 42.9%) facilities. Most of the institutions (97.2%) had at least one US machine available for perioperative care and US was available for 24-hour use at most facilities (76.7%). The data pertaining to the institutions at which respondents worked is presented in Table II.

Table II: Institutional data (N = 571)

| | <i>n</i> | [%] |
|---------------------------------------------------------|----------|--------|
| Level of hospital | | |
| District | 56 | [9.8] |
| Regional | 171 | [29.9] |
| Tertiary | 442 | [77.7] |
| No. of operating rooms | | |
| 1 to 3 | 18 | [3.2] |
| 4 to 10 | 245 | [42.9] |
| ≥ 10 | 308 | [53.9] |
| No. of US machines for perioperative care | | |
| 0 | 13 | [2.8] |
| 1 | 176 | [30.8] |
| 2 | 134 | [23.5] |
| 3 | 64 | [11.2] |
| 4 | 58 | [10.2] |
| ≥ 5 | 126 | [22.1] |
| US readily available during daytime (07h00–17h00) | | |
| Yes | 393 | [68.8] |
| Sometimes | 152 | [26.6] |
| No (locked away/special authorisation) | 26 | [4.6] |
| US readily available after hours and weekends | | |
| Yes | 438 | [76.7] |
| Sometimes | 87 | [15.2] |
| No (locked away/special authorisation) | 46 | [8.1] |
| US is common practice for cardiac assessments | | |
| Yes | 188 | [32.9] |
| Sometimes | 172 | [30.1] |
| No | 211 | [36.9] |
| US is common practice for lung assessments | | |
| Yes | 78 | [13.7] |
| Sometimes | 220 | [38.5] |
| No | 273 | [47.8] |
| US is common practice for regional anaesthesia | | |
| Yes | 475 | [83.2] |
| Sometimes | 72 | [12.6] |
| No | 24 | [4.2] |
| US is common practice for neuraxial (spinals/epidurals) | | |
| Yes | 36 | [6.3] |
| Sometimes | 87 | [15.2] |
| No | 448 | [78.4] |
| US is common practice for CVC insertions | | |
| Yes | 447 | [78.2] |
| Sometimes | 93 | [16.3] |
| No | 31 | [5.4] |
| US is common practice for difficult A-line insertions | | |
| Yes | 283 | [49.5] |
| Sometimes | 205 | [35.9] |
| No | 83 | [14.5] |

| US is common practice for difficult peripheral line insertions | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Yes | 153 [26.8] |
| Sometimes | 219 [38.4] |
| No | 199 [34.9] |

Most respondents observed that the use of US is common practice for central venous catheter (CVC) insertions (78.2%) and regional anaesthesia (83.2%) at their institutions. US for difficult arterial insertions was a common practice at almost half (49.5%) of the respondents' institutions whereas US for difficult peripheral line insertions was less common. US was used less commonly used for cardiac assessments (32.9%) and lung assessments (13.7%) whenever indicated. US was not commonly practiced for neuraxial anaesthesia.

Table III: Individual data (N = 571)

| Individual practice | Always | Frequently | Sometimes | Seldom | Never |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| I use ultrasound guidance when inserting a central line. | 325 [56.9] | 120 [21.0] | 55 [9.6] | 29 [5.1] | 42 [7.4] |
| I use ultrasound guidance for arterial cannulation. | 23 [4.0] | 73 [12.8] | 194 [34.0] | 169 [29.6] | 112 [19.6] |
| I use ultrasound guidance for difficult peripheral line insertion. | 23 [4.0] | 60 [10.5] | 137 [24.0] | 143 [25.0] | 208 [36.4] |
| I use ultrasound guidance when performing regional blocks. | 367 [64.3] | 103 [18.0] | 38 [6.7] | 19 [3.3] | 44 [7.7] |
| I use ultrasound guidance for spinal and epidural blocks. | 3 [0.5] | 5 [0.9] | 33 [5.8] | 95 [16.6] | 435 [76.2] |
| I use ultrasound for cardiac assessments whenever indicated. | 60 [10.5] | 91 [15.9] | 140 [24.5] | 103 [18.0] | 177 [31.0] |
| I use ultrasound for lung assessments whenever indicated. | 36 [6.3] | 65 [11.4] | 115 [20.1] | 134 [23.5] | 221 [38.7] |

All results are presented as n [%].

In terms of individual practices, as detailed in Table III, a vast majority of respondents reported that they “always” or “frequently” used US for CVC insertion (77.9%) and when performing regional anaesthesia (82.3%), but much less frequently for neuraxial anaesthesia (1.4%). The use of US for arterial cannulation and difficult peripheral line insertion, was also uncommon. Regarding POCUS for cardiac and lung assessment, 49.0% and 62.2% of respondents respectively “never” or “seldomly” used this modality.

Two-thirds of respondents reported that they had received some form of US training (as summarised in Table IV), but only one-third of respondents “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that they felt confident regarding their US skill set. Participation in workshops was the most common form of training (58.0%) and 27.3% of respondents had received US training during their registrar training. Of the respondents, 84.4% indicated that they would still like to receive US training and 71.1% were planning to undertake some form of US training, with workshops and peer-to-peer training being the preferred choices. Almost all respondents (96.5%) “strongly agreed” or “agreed” that US is an important skill for anaesthetists.

Table 4: Training data (N = 571)

| | n | [%] |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|---|-----|
| Have you received training in perioperative ultrasound use? | | |

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--------|
| Yes | 382 | [66.9] |
| No | 189 | [33.1] |
| <hr/> | | |
| I feel confident in my POCUS skills | | |
| Strongly agree | 44 | [7.7] |
| Agree | 154 | [27.0] |
| Neutral | 141 | [24.7] |
| Disagree | 145 | [25.4] |
| Strongly disagree | 87 | [15.2] |
| <hr/> | | |
| I have received training in POCUS through | | |
| Registrar training | 156 | [27.3] |
| Fellowship training | 15 | [2.6] |
| Peer-to-peer training | 176 | [30.8] |
| Workshops (e.g. FATE) | 331 | [58.0] |
| Self-trained | 187 | [32.7] |
| <hr/> | | |
| Is there a colleague with whom you can review your POCUS findings if needed? | | |
| Always | 56 | [9.8] |
| Frequently | 188 | [32.9] |
| Sometimes | 165 | [28.9] |
| Seldom | 103 | [18.0] |
| Never | 59 | [10.4] |
| <hr/> | | |
| I would like to receive ultrasound training | | |
| Yes | 482 | [84.4] |
| No | 28 | [4.9] |
| Maybe | 61 | [10.7] |
| <hr/> | | |
| I plan to undertake ultrasound training | | |
| Yes | 406 | [71.1] |
| No | 33 | [5.8] |
| Maybe | 132 | [23.1] |
| <hr/> | | |
| If you PLAN to undertake training, in what format should the training be? | | |
| Hands-on workshop(s) (e.g. FATE) | 462 | [80.9] |
| Online workshops/webinars | 240 | [42.0] |
| Formal fellowship training | 105 | [18.4] |
| Peer-to-peer training within your institution | 261 | [45.7] |
| Self-training | 138 | [24.2] |
| <hr/> | | |
| I am NOT planning to undertake ultrasound training because | | |
| I have sufficient training | 15 | [2.6] |
| Training is not available easily in my institution | 8 | [1.4] |
| It is not needed in my practice | 7 | [1.2] |
| I have no interest in ultrasound training | 5 | [0.9] |
| I do not see the benefit in ultrasound training | 3 | [0.5] |
| <hr/> | | |
| Ultrasound guidance is an important skill for all anaesthetists | | |
| Strongly agree | 464 | [81.3] |
| Agree | 87 | [15.2] |
| Neutral | 13 | [2.3] |
| Disagree | 6 | [1.1] |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | [0.2] |

Discussion

This is the first study of its kind evaluating the current practice pattern of perioperative US use among South African anaesthetists. A similar study of 66 anaesthetists conducted in a well-resourced Canadian context in 2018 identified the major barrier to the use of POCUS being limited US resources, with US in this context most commonly used for regional anaesthesia and CVC insertion.¹ These findings are similar to our findings in that 78.2% of South African respondents regularly use US for CVC insertion compared to 90% in the Canadian group.¹ The NICE guidelines state that “US guidance should be used in most clinical circumstances where CVC insertion is necessary and that all those involved in placing CVCs using US guidance should undertake appropriate training to achieve competence”.⁴

The use of US in peripheral nerve block has been shown to reduce block performance time, increase block success, improve block quality, and allow adequate visualisation of surrounding structures, needle and catheter (American Society of Regional Anesthesia [ASRA] guideline: Level Ib evidence).⁷ Our current practice of regional anaesthesia pattern appears to be in line with the current recommendation with US being used “always” or “frequently” by 82.3% respondents, which is higher than that of high income countries (67%). Although US-guided arterial cannulation has been shown to improve first-pass success and reduce the number of attempts,⁸ the adoption rates of US for arterial lines insertion is low with only 16.8% of respondents using US guidance “always” or “frequently”.

The uptake of US for neuraxial anaesthesia among South African anaesthetists was very low, with only 1.4% of respondents using US “always” or “frequently”. The majority (92.8%) “never” or “seldom” used US. The practice of central neuraxial block (CNB) has traditionally relied on the palpation of bony anatomical landmarks, namely the iliac crests and spinous processes, together with tactile feedback during needle insertion.⁹ There is consistent evidence to suggest that neuraxial ultrasound can be used to identify vertebral levels more accurately than palpation of surface anatomical landmarks. A 2015 systematic review highlighted the poor correlation between vertebral levels determined by ultrasound and palpation, with rates of agreement varying from 14% to 64%.¹⁰ As per the ASRA guidelines, the use of US in neuraxial blockade shortens the procedural time, improves block success and allows better prediction of epidural depth.⁷ Further training in US guidance for neuraxial anaesthesia may be valuable.

FATE is an invaluable perioperative extension to the clinical examination.¹¹ The bedside use of ultrasound imaging aids with rapid diagnosis of severe and life-threatening pathological conditions that may change clinical management and impact on patient outcome.¹¹ This study showed that only 49.0% and 62.2% of respondents “never” or “seldom” used US whenever indicated for cardiac and lung assessments, respectively. These findings suggest that most South African anaesthetists may not have integrated POCUS for cardiac and lung assessment into daily clinical practice. Given that POCUS is becoming the standard of care in anaesthesia internationally, this suggests that further training and formalisation of POCUS standards is essential in South Africa. As Neethling et al.¹¹ suggest, “by incorporating POCUS as part of our armamentarium, we might see it reach its full clinical potential, optimising patient care and improving patient outcomes”.

An important barrier to US as identified by our respondents was lack of US training at the postgraduate level. It is important to note that only 27.3% of respondents received US training as a registrar and 32.7% of respondents were self-trained. The latest published FCA curriculum (2014) does not mention US skills nor competence required from a specialist trainee nor is there any formal logbook of US procedures required for qualification.¹² However, questions on

POCUS do form a significant part of the final FCA exams. In this regard, there seems to be a gap in the current curriculum, suggesting that an updated curriculum incorporating POCUS skills is necessary. This is in contrast to The College of Emergency Medicine of South Africa (CEMSA) which has a credentialing procedure for emergency physicians or other clinicians who wish to perform emergency ultrasound in the emergency department for diagnostic purposes, or even as an adjunct in the placement of CVCs.¹³ Fellows of the CEMSA are expected to have both appropriate training and practical experience to perform and interpret basic emergency US examinations.

Mahmood et al.,¹⁴ representing a group of international experts in the fields of cardiothoracic, general and regional anaesthesiology, critical care and pain medicine, recommended that perioperative US training should be continuous and structured. They advocate that residency programmes should create their own teaching tools and evaluation metrics to demonstrate the progression of learners.

The findings of this study suggest that there is a need to incorporate US in the undergraduate curriculum. In a study evaluating training medical students, with no previous US experience to perform basic US-guided vascular access and basic FATE, Heiberg et al.¹⁵ showed that medical students were able to rapidly improve their skills from baseline with the use of an e-learning package and a four-hour hands-on session. It is believed that clinicians are more likely to incorporate ultrasound into their daily practice if it is introduced at an early stage of their careers.¹⁵

There are currently multiple different courses available for training in POCUS: FATE as previously mentioned, extended focused assessment with sonography for trauma (e-FAST), bedside lung ultrasound in emergency (BLUE), focused echocardiographic evaluation in life support (FEEL), focused intensive care echocardiography (FICE) and haemodynamic echocardiography examination in real time (HART), among many others.¹¹ All these have a similar goal, that is to provide a structure to non-cardiologist practitioners to diagnose or confirm a specific clinical cardiorespiratory emergency that is responsible for patient haemodynamic instability. POCUS is easily taught, non-invasive and readily available.¹¹ This study showed that 58.0% of the study respondents had US training through courses and workshops. Some respondents felt that there is a lack of awareness of POCUS benefits and courses available. By promoting access to these courses nationally and advocating the benefits, there may be more interest in completing these courses. This study did not evaluate which courses the survey respondents attended, but establishing which courses would be most useful for our context would be of value.

The assumption that a lack of availability of US equipment would be a major barrier to the use of POCUS in South Africa was refuted as 68.8% of respondents had US readily available during daytime, and even more reported availability after hours (76.7%). Factors limiting use such as limited numbers of machines being shared by multiple theatres during daytime hours were not elucidated. The findings, however, suggest that using POCUS when indicated within a resource-limited setting is achievable and should be encouraged. South African anaesthetists, however, still perceived that one of the most important barriers to US was lack of equipment. There may be institutional logistical factors that could contribute to this perception. For example, US equipment being stored or locked away outside operation theatres and thus not readily accessible in an emergency setting. In solo private practice, surgical slate pressure and lack of peer support may also limit the use of POCUS.

Barriers that could be addressed in the promotion of more widespread US use include appropriate provision of equipment and increased formal training in order to improve competence and confidence.¹⁶ With improved skills and confidence in POCUS use, time spent

performing exams becomes less of a factor. The importance of continued training and supervision should be emphasised for skill maintenance.

Although respondents indicated that they would like to use US, had the requisite training and generally had access to US equipment, respondents also indicated that the two most important barriers to POCUS use in South Africa were lack of equipment and lack of training at the postgraduate level. Other perceived barriers to POCUS use in South Africa were lack of training at undergraduate level, lack of POCUS courses nationally and lack of awareness of its benefits. Specific feedback from some respondents indicated that there are certain circumstances, such as pressure from surgical colleagues, that discourage an anaesthetist from gaining self-confidence in using US.

Limitations

The response rate for this study was 22.9% among SASA members. Although the confidence interval of 3.9 is acceptable, the sample was self-selected, and given the fact that this was an online survey, there may have been selection bias by POCUS practitioners. Therefore, the results may underestimate the practice and availability of US among less enthusiastic users, or those with less access to US machines. Not all South African doctors who provide anaesthesia are registered with SASA, and some may not have received the invitation to participate in the survey. The results of this study may therefore not necessarily be generalisable to the entire country as smaller provinces were less represented. This study could also have been biased towards obtaining information from physicians with access to the internet, smart phone applications, WhatsApp accounts and an active email address. However, this was not expected to be a significant limitation, considering the general easy accessibility and widespread use of email and social media. Response rates to emailed or web-based surveys are comparable to a mailed hard copy survey.¹⁷

The researchers also did not survey the hospitals independently or cross-checked equipment availability with hospital and anaesthetic department management. Further, this study did not interrogate the availability of the different types of US equipment; for example the different types of US probes available, portability of US machines, or the availability of special needles for regional anaesthesia. Importantly, one must not disregard the costs of US equipment and related disposables, which may be extremely relevant in a resource-limited setting like South Africa. Given the rapidly diminishing cost of small, handheld ultrasound machines, economics may be less of a factor in the acquisition of ultrasound devices in future.

Recommendations

A national audit of POCUS equipment for anaesthesia at hospitals would provide more insight into US equipment available for perioperative care. Comparing such information with clinical practice may truly reflect the uptake of POCUS among South African anaesthetists. We strongly recommend formalising POCUS in the FCA curriculum and the use of procedural logbooks for US procedures and skills as part of the FCA portfolio of learning. The use of ultrasound should be included from the outset of specialist training of anaesthetists and tested in the FCA OSCE exam, similar to the American Board of Anesthesiology (ABA) Applied exam.^{2,3} Making POCUS workshops or online modules more accessible will also increase training opportunities for anaesthetists, especially for those who do not work in major cities or centres. In addition, there must be ongoing emphasis and awareness about the benefits of POCUS in perioperative care, and opportunities must be afforded anaesthetists to practice skills learnt under supervision.

Conclusion

US in the South African perioperative setting is common for CVC insertion and regional anaesthesia, but less frequent in relatively new applications such as cardiac and lung assessments, as well as peripheral vascular access and neuraxial anaesthesia. Ultrasound machine availability should not be a barrier to the widespread use of POCUS by local practitioners. South African anaesthetists are enthusiastic about upskilling themselves and introducing US more regularly into their practice. However, there may be some shortcomings in the current training standards and curricula that can potentially hinder further US adoption. A matched administrative effort at formalising US training, incorporating procedural logbooks in the FCA curriculum, and making US training or workshops more accessible with the input from the South African College of Anaesthesia may assist in improving the fate of POCUS in our daily practice.

Acknowledgements

This research was endorsed by the SASA CEO Ms Natalie Zimmelman. We thank her for her encouragement. We also thank Mr Dawid van Straaten from ANSA/Safe Surgery SA for his assistance in setting up the REDCap survey database.

The authors are also grateful to Professor Bruce Biccard and Dr Richard Llewellyn for their invaluable writing and editing assistance.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding source

No funding was required.

Ethical approval

Ethical approval was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Cape Town (HREC 397/2020) prior to distribution of the questionnaire.

ORCID

MIS Kathrada <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6467-8898>

M Jagga <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1096-1182>

YN Mzoneli <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9772-3907>

J Swanevelder <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6986-4470>

MW Gibbs <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3283-2552>

References

1. Chui J, Lavi R, Hegazy AF, et al. Identifying barriers to the use of ultrasound in the perioperative period: a survey of southwestern Ontario anesthesiologists. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2019;19:214. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-4040-2>
2. Pulton D, Feinman J. Hocus POCUS: making barriers to perioperative point-of-care ultrasound disappear. *Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth.* 2019;33:2419-20. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.jvca.2019.05.028>
3. SASA practice guidelines 2018 revision. *South Afr J Anaesth Analg* [Internet]. 2018;24:S1-119 Available from: [https://sasaapi.sasaweb.com/Document/SAJAA\(V24N1\)2061SASAPracticeGuidelines_V12_636803016948256880.pdf](https://sasaapi.sasaweb.com/Document/SAJAA(V24N1)2061SASAPracticeGuidelines_V12_636803016948256880.pdf). Accessed on 6 August 2021.

4. Guidance on the use of ultrasound locating devices for placing central venous catheters. National Institute for Health Care and Excellence [Internet]. 2002;49:1-32. Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ta49/resources/guidance-on-the-use-of-ultrasound-locating-devices-for-placing-central-venous-catheters-pdf-2294585518021>. Accessed on 6 August 2021.
5. Lamperti M, Bodenham AR, Pittiruti M, et al. International evidence-based recommendations on ultrasound-guided vascular access. *Intensive Care Med.* 2012;38:1105-17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-012-2597-x>
6. Hansen MA, Juhl-Olsen P, Thorn S, Frederiksen CA, Sloth E. Ultrasonography-guided catheterization. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand.* 2014;58:446-52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aas.12299>
7. Neal JM, Brull R, Horn J, et al. The second American Society of Regional Anesthesia and Pain Medicine evidence-based medicine assessment of ultrasound-guided. *Reg Anesth Pain Med.* 2016;41(2):181-94. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AAP.0000000000000331>
8. White L, Halpin A, Turner M, Wallace L. Ultrasound-guided radial artery cannulation in adult and paediatric populations: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Anaesth.* 2016;116(5):610-7. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bja/aew097>
9. Ghosh S, Madjdpour C, Chin K. Ultrasound-guided lumbar central neuraxial block. *BJA Educ.* 2016;16(7):213-20. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjaed/mkv048>
10. Perlas A, Chaparro LE, Chin KJ. Lumbar neuraxial ultrasound for spinal and epidural anesthesia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Reg Anesth Pain Med.* 2016;41(2):251-60. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/AAP.0000000000000184>
11. Neethling E, Roodt F, Beck C, Swanevelder JLC. Point-of-care and lung ultrasound incorporated in daily practice. *S Afr Med J.* 2018;108(5):376-81. <https://doi.org/10.7196/SAMJ.2018.v108i5.13313>
12. College of Anaesthetists of South Africa. Curriculum for trainees in anaesthesiology 2014 [Internet]. 2014;1-51. Available from: [https://www.cmsa.co.za/force_download.aspx?documentid=65524159333436363865524159&Name=FCA\(SA\)%20Curriculum%20%E2%80%93%20Feb%202014](https://www.cmsa.co.za/force_download.aspx?documentid=65524159333436363865524159&Name=FCA(SA)%20Curriculum%20%E2%80%93%20Feb%202014). Accessed on 21 May 2021.
13. Wells M, Goldstein LN, Beringer C, Farham B. Emergency Medicine Society of South Africa guidelines for the training and credentialing in emergency point-of-care ultrasound. *S Afr Med J.* 2021;111(5b). <https://dx.doi.org/10.7196/SAMJ.2021.v111i5b.15346>
14. Mahmood F, Matyal R, Skubas N, et al. Perioperative ultrasound training in anaesthesiology: a call to action. *Anesth Analg.* 2016;122(6):1794-804. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000001134>
15. Heiberg J, Hansen LS, Wemmelund K, et al. Point-of-care clinical ultrasound for medical students. *Ultrasound Int Open.* 2015;1(2): E58-66. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1055/s-0035-1565173>
16. Westcott GE, Morrell D. Ultrasonography in anaesthesia and intensive care: a mixed methods study of current clinical practice at a resource-constrained tertiary hospital in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa [unpublished dissertation, accepted MMed]. Mthatha: Walter Sisulu University; 2019. p. 1-84.
17. Yetter G, Capaccioli K. Differences in responses to Web and paper surveys among school professionals. *Behav Res.* 2010; 42: 266–272. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.42.1.266>.

Supplementary File 1

| Institutional characteristics | Total (N= 571) | Medical officers (n = 84) | Registrars (n = 147) | Consultants (n = 318) | GP anaesthetists (n = 22) |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | n [%] | n [%] | n [%] | n [%] | n [%] |
| Level of hospital | | | | | |
| District | 56 [9.8] | 12 [14.3] | 18 [12.2] | 22 [6.9] | 4 [18.2] |
| Regional | 171 [29.9] | 39 [46.4] | 32 [38.1] | 87 [27.4] | 13 [59.1] |
| Tertiary | 442 [77.7] | 44 [52.4] | 144 [98.0] | 244 [76.7] | 10 [45.5] |
| No. of operating rooms | | | | | |
| 1 to 3 | 18 [3.2] | 3 [3.6] | 0 [0] | 13 [40.9] | 2 [9.1] |
| 4 to 10 | 245 [42.9] | 68 [81.0] | 25 [17.0] | 139 [43.7] | 13 [59.1] |
| ≥ 10 | 308 [53.9] | 13 [15.5] | 122 [83.0] | 166 [52.2] | 7 [31.8] |
| No. of US machines for perioperative care | | | | | |
| 0 | 13 [2.8] | 1 [1.2] | 0 [0] | 10 [3.14] | 2 [9.1] |
| 1 | 176 [30.8] | 40 [47.6] | 7 [4.8] | 113 [35.5] | 16 [72.7] |
| 2 | 134 [23.5] | 29 [34.5] | 27 [18.3] | 75 [23.6] | 3 [13.6] |
| 3 | 64 [11.2] | 10 [11.9] | 17 [11.6] | 37 [11.6] | 0 [0] |
| 4 | 58 [10.2] | 1 [1.2] | 28 [19.0] | 29 [9.1] | 0 [0] |
| ≥ 5 | 126 [22.1] | 3 [3.6] | 68 [46.3] | 54 [17.0] | 1 [4.5] |
| US readily available during daytime (07h00–17h00) | | | | | |
| Yes | 393 [68.8] | 64 [76.2] | 91 [61.9] | 229 [72.0] | 9 [40.9] |
| Sometimes | 152 [26.6] | 18 [21.4] | 47 [31.9] | 79 [24.8] | 8 [36.4] |
| No (locked away/special authorisation) | 26 [4.6] | 2 [23.8] | 9 [6.1] | 10 [31.4] | 5 [22.7] |
| US readily available after hours and weekends | | | | | |
| Yes | 438 [76.7] | 66 [78.6] | 122 [83.0] | 240 [74.5] | 10 [45.5] |
| Sometimes | 87 [15.2] | 10 [11.9] | 15 [10.2] | 56 [17.6] | 6 [27.2] |
| No (locked away/special authorisation) | 46 [8.1] | 8 [9.5] | 10 [6.8] | 22 [6.9] | 6 [27.2] |
| US is common practice for cardiac assessments | | | | | |
| Yes | 188 [32.9] | 11 [13.1] | 79 [53.7] | 92 [28.9] | 6 [27.2] |
| Sometimes | 172 [30.1] | 40 [47.6] | 47 [32.0] | 119 [37.4] | 5 [22.7] |
| No | 211 [36.9] | 33 [39.2] | 21 [14.3] | 107 [33.6] | 11 [50.0] |
| US is common practice for lung assessments | | | | | |
| Yes | 78 [13.7] | 8 [9.5] | 42 [28.6] | 27 [8.5] | 1 [4.5] |
| Sometimes | 220 [38.5] | 25 [29.8] | 73 [49.7] | 119 [37.4] | 3 [13.6] |
| No | 273 [47.8] | 51 [60.7] | 32 [21.8] | 172 [54.1] | 18 [81.8] |
| US is common practice for regional anaesthesia | | | | | |
| Yes | 475 [83.2] | 71 [84.5] | 139 [94.6] | 253 [79.6] | 12 [54.5] |
| Sometimes | 72 [12.6] | 9 [10.7] | 5 [3.4] | 53 [16.7] | 5 [22.7] |
| No | 24 [4.2] | 4 [4.8] | 3 [2.0] | 12 [37.7] | 5 [22.7] |
| US is common practice for neuraxial (spinals/epidurals) | | | | | |
| Yes | 36 [6.3] | 7 [8.3] | 10 [6.8] | 19 [6.0] | 0 [0] |
| Sometimes | 87 [15.2] | 8 [9.5] | 21 [14.3] | 54 [17.0] | 4 [18.2] |
| No | 448 [78.4] | 69 [82.1] | 116 [78.9] | 245 [77.0] | 18 [81.8] |
| US is common practice for CVC insertions | | | | | |
| Yes | 447 [78.2] | 67 [79.8] | 131 [89.1] | 240 [75.5] | 9 [40.9] |
| Sometimes | 93 [16.3] | 11 [13.1] | 16 [10.9] | 59 [18.6] | 7 [31.8] |
| No | 31 [5.4] | 6 [7.1] | 0 [0] | 19 [59.7] | 6 [27.2] |
| US is common practice for difficult A-line insertions | | | | | |
| Yes | 283 [49.5] | 37 [44.0] | 85 [57.8] | 154 [48.4] | 7 [31.8] |
| Sometimes | 205 [35.9] | 31 [36.9] | 45 [30.6] | 121 [38.1] | 8 [36.3] |
| No | 83 [14.5] | 16 [19.0] | 17 [11.6] | 43 [13.5] | 7 [31.8] |
| US is common practice for difficult peripheral line insertions | | | | | |
| Yes | 153 [26.8] | 14 [16.7] | 59 [40.3] | 80 [25.2] | 0 [0] |
| Sometimes | 219 [38.4] | 35 [41.7] | 59 [40.3] | 115 [36.2] | 10 [45.5] |
| No | 199 [34.9] | 35 [41.7] | 29 [19.7] | 123 [38.7] | 12 [54.5] |

Perioperative ultrasound among South African anaesthetists: a survey of current practice and availability

MIS Kathrada,¹ M Jagga,¹ YN Mzoneli,² J Swanevelder,¹ MW Gibbs¹

¹Department of Anaesthesia and Perioperative Medicine, University of Cape Town, South Africa

²Discipline of Anaesthesiology and Critical Care, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa

Corresponding author, email: matthew.gibbs@uct.ac.za

Background: Point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) is becoming part of the standard skill set of the modern-day anaesthetist. There is limited knowledge regarding the availability of ultrasound (US) and POCUS skills in South Africa. There may be barriers to adopting US in many institutions.

Methods: An observational cohort questionnaire was distributed via an online REDCap survey. All doctors practising anaesthesia in South Africa were eligible. Recruitment was done via an email link that was sent to South African Society of Anaesthesiologists (SASA) members. Non-SASA members were recruited via departmental mailing lists or social media.

Results: Of the 580 respondents, 478 were SASA members (response rate 22.9%, confidence interval 3.94) and 102 were non-SASA members. In total, 571 surveys were suitable for analysis, 397 (69.5%) respondents had more than five years anaesthesia experience, 558 (97.7%) of respondents worked in hospitals that have US machines available, and 76.7% had US readily available after hours. Respondents used US mostly for central venous catheter (CVC) insertions (77.9%), regional anaesthesia (82.3%), and cardiac and lung assessments (26.4% and 17.7%, respectively). It is used much less frequently for neuraxial anaesthesia (1.4%). Of the respondents, 382 (66.9%) had received US training, only 198 (34.7%) felt confident in their US skills, and 482 (84.4%) wish to have further US training. The two most significant barriers to US were lack of equipment and lack of training at postgraduate level.

Conclusion: South African anaesthetists work at institutions where US equipment is generally available, and most practitioners want to incorporate US in their practice. However, anaesthetists feel insecure with respect to their skills and indicated that they wish to receive further training. Efforts should be made to formalise POCUS training in the Fellowship of the College of Anaesthetists (FCA) curriculum and make US training more accessible.

Keywords: anaesthetists, point-of-care ultrasound, POCUS, FATE, ultrasound guidance, South Africa, training

Introduction

Point-of-care ultrasound (POCUS) plays an important role in vascular access placement, regional nerve blocks, and heart and lung assessments in the perioperative period. Its use has been shown to reduce failure and complication rates, thereby improving patient safety and procedural efficiency.¹ Ultrasound (US) use among anaesthesiologists has gained greater importance in postgraduate training. Specialist training milestones, such as those developed by the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) and the American Board of Anesthesiology (ABA), have incorporated US for nerve blocks, vascular access and certain pain procedures.²

Many international guidelines, including those issued by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) in the United Kingdom (UK) and the Canadian Anesthesiologists' Society (CAS), have recommended the routine use of US guidance when performing invasive procedures such as central venous cannulations.^{1,4} As per the 2018 guidelines of the South African Society of Anaesthesiologists (SASA), US is now considered as part of the basic skill set of an anaesthesiologist.³ The introduction of US technology has revolutionised the field of regional anaesthesia.³ Focused assessment using transthoracic echocardiography (FATE) is an invaluable perioperative extension

to the clinical examination.³ Also, the use of US imaging aids with rapid diagnosis of severe and life-threatening pathological conditions, and may change clinical management and impact on patient outcome.^{5,6} In many international centres, US is included in the training of anaesthesiologists from the outset.³

In South Africa, however, there is limited knowledge as to the availability of ultrasound for POCUS and the skills necessary for training among anaesthetists. It is not clear what factors affect the uptake of POCUS in a resource-limited setting such as South Africa. The primary objective of this study was to determine how US is used perioperatively for vascular access placement, nerve blocks, and heart and lung assessments. The study also sought to identify training experiences, desire for further US training and preferences in modes of training from participants. Secondary objectives were to identify the barriers and limitations preventing US use among South African anaesthetists.

Methods

This study was conducted using a questionnaire that was made available in an online digital format. Approval was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Cape Town (HREC 397/2020) prior to distribution of the questionnaire.

This questionnaire that was used was adapted (with permission) from a similar survey conducted by Chui et al.¹ in 2018 in Southwestern Ontario. The questionnaire was modified to suit the South African context and validated by doing a pilot survey with a small sample of twelve anaesthetists who use POCUS.

The questionnaire was run for a 6-week period from 19 August 2020 to 2 October 2020. Participants were recruited via a link which was either sent by email to all SASA members, or distributed through a web-based link on anaesthesia departmental mailing lists and on social media WhatsApp groups. Follow-up reminders were sent out during the 6-week period.

All anaesthesia practitioners from South Africa were eligible to participate. SASA members working in South Africa were especially approached for inclusion as they represent a feasible and reliable sample of all potential respondents that could be reached via the SASA membership database. Specialists, trainees and non-specialist anaesthetists were included. The survey was composed of 39 questions and was estimated to take approximately less than five minutes to complete. The questions were designed to address five main aspects: i) respondent characteristics, ii) institution characteristics, iii) individual practice, iv) training in US and US training preferences, and v) barriers and limitations to using US. Informed consent was obtained electronically prior to respondents participating in the survey.

Data were captured using REDCap, in collaboration with Safe Surgery SA and the Anaesthesia Network for South Africa (ANSA). The survey data were analysed using Microsoft Excel. Descriptive statistics, including mean, modes and percentages, were reported as appropriate to assess the data. From the SASA membership, based on a confidence level of 95% and confidence interval of 5, the minimum sample size required was 324 (response rate 15.6%).

Results

Participants

Eligible participants for this study include doctors who currently practise anaesthesia in South Africa. This included specialists, registrars (trainee specialists) and non-specialists (medical officers and GP anaesthetists). At the time of the survey, there were 2 082 doctors on the SASA membership database currently practicing anaesthesia in South Africa. The total number of respondents was 580, of which 472 were SASA members. Nine surveys were incomplete and therefore discarded (Figure 1).




Figure 1: Analysed responses

With a sample size of 478 out of 2 082 SASA members (response rate 22.9%), the confidence interval is 3.94.

The demographics of the respondents and the institutions at which they practice are summarised in Table I and Table II, respectively. Respondents were mostly between 30 and 49 years of age (70.9%). Most of the respondents were consultant anaesthetists (55.7%), 25.7% were registrars and 14.7% were medical officers. Only a small minority were GP anaesthetists (3.9%) and 4.4% had no anaesthesia qualifications. Almost all of the respondents were full-time anaesthetists (93.0%). Of the respondents, 58.8% worked in state hospitals, 32.4% in private hospitals and 8.8% worked in both. The majority of respondents work in the four most populated South African provinces, namely Western Cape (34.9%), Gauteng (25.7%), KwaZulu-Natal (20.3%) and Eastern Cape (8.4%). Detailed data about the respondents regarding their designation and the institutions where they work is available in Supplementary File 1.

Table I: Respondent data (n = 571)

| | n | % |
|------------------------------------------|-----|------|
| Gender | | |
| Male | 303 | 53.1 |
| Female | 265 | 46.4 |
| Prefer not to disclose | 3 | 0.5 |
| Age group | | |
| 20–29 | 41 | 7.2 |
| 30–39 | 266 | 46.6 |
| 40–49 | 139 | 24.3 |
| 50–59 | 77 | 13.5 |
| 60–69 | 43 | 7.5 |
| > 69 | 5 | 0.9 |
| Designation | | |
| Medical officer | 84 | 14.7 |
| Registrar | 147 | 25.7 |
| Consultant | 318 | 55.7 |
| GP anaesthetist | 22 | 3.9 |
| Highest anaesthesia qualification | | |
| None | 25 | 4.4 |
| DA | 224 | 39.2 |
| FCA (or equivalent) | 305 | 53.4 |
| Subspecialists | 17 | 3.0 |
| Practice setting | | |
| Full-time practice | 531 | 93.0 |
| Part-time practice | 40 | 7.0 |
| Workplace | | |
| State practice | 336 | 58.8 |
| Private practice | 185 | 32.4 |
| Both | 50 | 8.8 |
| Province of practice | | |
| Eastern Cape | 48 | 8.4 |
| Free State | 30 | 5.3 |
| Gauteng | 147 | 25.7 |
| KwaZulu-Natal | 116 | 20.3 |
| Limpopo | 2 | 0.4 |
| Mpumalanga | 9 | 1.6 |
| Northern Cape | 14 | 2.5 |
| North-West | 6 | 1.1 |
| Western Cape | 199 | 34.9 |

DA – Diploma in Anaesthesia, FCA – Fellow of College of Anaesthetists

Institutional characteristics

Of the respondents, 77.7% worked mostly at tertiary level hospitals, 29.9% at regional and the remaining 9.8% at district hospitals. Respondents predominantly worked at either large

Table II: Institutional data (n = 571)

| | n | % |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------|
| Level of hospital | | |
| District | 56 | 9.8 |
| Regional | 171 | 29.9 |
| Tertiary | 442 | 77.7 |
| No of operating rooms | | |
| 1–3 | 18 | 3.2 |
| 4–10 | 245 | 42.9 |
| ≥ 10 | 308 | 53.9 |
| No of US machines for perioperative care | | |
| 0 | 13 | 2.8 |
| 1 | 176 | 30.8 |
| 2 | 134 | 23.5 |
| 3 | 64 | 11.2 |
| 4 | 58 | 10.2 |
| ≥ 5 | 126 | 22.1 |
| US readily available during daytime (07h00–17h00) | | |
| Yes | 393 | 68.8 |
| Sometimes | 152 | 26.6 |
| No (locked away/special authorisation) | 26 | 4.6 |
| US readily available after hours and weekends | | |
| Yes | 438 | 76.7 |
| Sometimes | 87 | 15.2 |
| No (locked away/special authorisation) | 46 | 8.1 |
| US is common practice for cardiac assessments | | |
| Yes | 188 | 32.9 |
| Sometimes | 172 | 30.1 |
| No | 211 | 36.9 |
| US is common practice for lung assessments | | |
| Yes | 78 | 13.7 |
| Sometimes | 220 | 38.5 |
| No | 273 | 47.8 |
| US is common practice for regional anaesthesia | | |
| Yes | 475 | 83.2 |
| Sometimes | 72 | 12.6 |
| No | 24 | 4.2 |
| US is common practice for neuraxial (spinals/epidurals) | | |
| Yes | 36 | 6.3 |
| Sometimes | 87 | 15.2 |
| No | 448 | 78.4 |
| US is common practice for CVC insertions | | |
| Yes | 447 | 78.2 |
| Sometimes | 93 | 16.3 |
| No | 31 | 5.4 |
| US is common practice for difficult A-line insertions | | |
| Yes | 283 | 49.5 |
| Sometimes | 205 | 35.9 |
| No | 83 | 14.5 |
| US is common practice for difficult peripheral line insertions | | |
| Yes | 153 | 26.8 |
| Sometimes | 219 | 38.4 |
| No | 199 | 34.9 |

(≥ 10 operating rooms; 53.9%) or medium (4–10 operating rooms; 42.9%) facilities. Most of the institutions (97.2%) had at least one US machine available for perioperative care and US was available for 24-hour use at most facilities (76.7%). The data pertaining to the institutions at which respondents worked is presented in Table II.

Most respondents observed that the use of US is common practice for central venous catheter (CVC) insertions (78.2%) and regional anaesthesia (83.2%) at their institutions. US for difficult arterial insertions was a common practice at almost half (49.5%) of the respondents' institutions, whereas US for difficult peripheral line insertions was less common. US was used less commonly for cardiac assessments (32.9%) and lung assessments (13.7%) whenever indicated. US was not commonly practiced for neuraxial anaesthesia.

In terms of individual practices, as detailed in Table III, a vast majority of respondents reported that they "always" or "frequently" used US for CVC insertion (77.9%) and when performing regional anaesthesia (82.3%), but much less frequently for neuraxial anaesthesia (1.4%). The use of US for arterial cannulation and difficult peripheral line insertion, was also uncommon. Regarding POCUS for cardiac and lung assessment, 49.0% and 62.2% of respondents respectively "never" or "seldomly" used this modality.

Two-thirds of respondents reported that they had received some form of US training (as summarised in Table IV), but only one-third of respondents "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they felt confident regarding their US skill set. Participation in workshops was the most common form of training (58.0%) and 27.3% of respondents had received US training during their registrar training. Of the respondents, 84.4% indicated that they would still like to receive US training, and 71.1% were planning to undertake some form of US training, with workshops and peer-to-peer training being the preferred choices. Almost all respondents (96.5%) "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that US is an important skill for anaesthetists.

Discussion

This is the first study of its kind evaluating the current practice pattern of perioperative US use among South African anaesthetists. A similar study of 66 anaesthetists conducted in a well-resourced Canadian context in 2018 identified the major barrier to the use of POCUS being limited US resources, with US in this context most commonly used for regional anaesthesia and CVC insertion.¹ These findings are similar to our findings in that 78.2% of South African respondents regularly use US for CVC insertion compared to 90% in the Canadian group.¹ The NICE guidelines state that "US guidance should be used in most clinical circumstances where CVC insertion is necessary and that all those involved in placing CVCs using US guidance should undertake appropriate training to achieve competence"⁴

The use of US in peripheral nerve block has been shown to reduce block performance time, increase block success, improve block quality, and allow adequate visualisation of surrounding structures, needle and catheter (American Society of Regional Anesthesia [ASRA] guideline: Level Ib evidence).⁷ Our current practice of regional anaesthesia pattern appears to be in line with the current recommendation with US being used "always" or "frequently" by 82.3% respondents, which is higher than that of high-income countries (67%). Although US-guided arterial

Table III: Individual data (n = 571)

| Individual practice | Always | Frequently | Sometimes | Seldom | Never |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| I use ultrasound guidance when inserting a central line | 325 (56.9) | 120 (21.0) | 55 (9.6) | 29 (5.1) | 42 (7.4) |
| I use ultrasound guidance for arterial cannulation | 23 (4.0) | 73 (12.8) | 194 (34.0) | 169 (29.6) | 112 (19.6) |
| I use ultrasound guidance for difficult peripheral line insertion | 23 (4.0) | 60 (10.5) | 137 (24.0) | 143 (25.0) | 208 (36.4) |
| I use ultrasound guidance when performing regional blocks | 367 (64.3) | 103 (18.0) | 38 (6.7) | 19 (3.3) | 44 (7.7) |
| I use ultrasound guidance for spinal and epidural blocks | 3 (0.5) | 5 (0.9) | 33 (5.8) | 95 (16.6) | 435 (76.2) |
| I use ultrasound for cardiac assessments whenever indicated | 60 (10.5) | 91 (15.9) | 140 (24.5) | 103 (18.0) | 177 (31.0) |
| I use ultrasound for lung assessments whenever indicated | 36 (6.3) | 65 (11.4) | 115 (20.1) | 134 (23.5) | 221 (38.7) |

All results are presented as n %.

Table IV: Training data (n = 571)

| | n | % |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------|
| Have you received training in perioperative ultrasound use? | | |
| Yes | 382 | 66.9 |
| No | 189 | 33.1 |
| I feel confident in my POCUS skills | | |
| Strongly agree | 44 | 7.7 |
| Agree | 154 | 27.0 |
| Neutral | 141 | 24.7 |
| Disagree | 145 | 25.4 |
| Strongly disagree | 87 | 15.2 |
| I have received training in POCUS through | | |
| Registrar training | 156 | 27.3 |
| Fellowship training | 15 | 2.6 |
| Peer-to-peer training | 176 | 30.8 |
| Workshops (e.g. FATE) | 331 | 58.0 |
| Self-trained | 187 | 32.7 |
| Is there a colleague with whom you can review your POCUS findings if needed? | | |
| Always | 56 | 9.8 |
| Frequently | 188 | 32.9 |
| Sometimes | 165 | 28.9 |
| Seldom | 103 | 18.0 |
| Never | 59 | 10.4 |
| I would like to receive ultrasound training | | |
| Yes | 482 | 84.4 |
| No | 28 | 4.9 |
| Maybe | 61 | 10.7 |
| I plan to undertake ultrasound training | | |
| Yes | 406 | 71.1 |
| No | 33 | 5.8 |
| Maybe | 132 | 23.1 |
| If you PLAN to undertake training, in what format should the training be? | | |
| Hands-on workshop(s) (e.g. FATE) | 462 | 80.9 |
| Online workshops/webinars | 240 | 42.0 |
| Formal fellowship training | 105 | 18.4 |
| Peer-to-peer training within your institution | 261 | 45.7 |
| Self-training | 138 | 24.2 |
| I am NOT planning to undertake ultrasound training because | | |
| I have sufficient training | 15 | 2.6 |
| Training is not available easily in my institution | 8 | 1.4 |
| It is not needed in my practice | 7 | 1.2 |
| I have no interest in ultrasound training | 5 | 0.9 |
| I do not see the benefit in ultrasound training | 3 | 0.5 |
| Ultrasound guidance is an important skill for all anaesthetists | | |
| Strongly agree | 464 | 81.3 |
| Agree | 87 | 15.2 |
| Neutral | 13 | 2.3 |
| Disagree | 6 | 1.1 |
| Strongly disagree | 1 | 0.2 |

cannulation has been shown to improve first-pass success and reduce the number of attempts,⁸ the adoption rates of US for arterial lines insertion is low with only 16.8% of respondents using US guidance “always” or “frequently”.

The uptake of US for neuraxial anaesthesia among South African anaesthetists was very low, with only 1.4% of respondents using US “always” or “frequently”. The majority (92.8%) “never” or “seldom” used US. The practice of central neuraxial block (CNB) has traditionally relied on the palpation of bony anatomical landmarks, namely the iliac crests and spinous processes, together with tactile feedback during needle insertion.⁹ There is consistent evidence to suggest that neuraxial ultrasound can be used to identify vertebral levels more accurately than palpation of surface anatomical landmarks. A 2015 systematic review highlighted the poor correlation between vertebral levels determined by ultrasound and palpation, with rates of agreement varying from 14% to 64%.¹⁰ As per the ASRA guidelines, the use of US in neuraxial blockade shortens the procedural time, improves block success and allows better prediction of epidural depth.⁷ Further training in US guidance for neuraxial anaesthesia may be valuable.

FATE is an invaluable perioperative extension to the clinical examination.¹¹ The bedside use of ultrasound imaging aids with rapid diagnosis of severe and life-threatening pathological conditions that may change clinical management and impact on patient outcome.¹¹ This study showed that only 49.0% and 62.2% of respondents “never” or “seldom” used US whenever indicated for cardiac and lung assessments, respectively. These findings suggest that most South African anaesthetists may not have integrated POCUS for cardiac and lung assessment into daily clinical practice. Given that POCUS is becoming the standard of care in anaesthesia internationally, this suggests that further training and formalisation of POCUS standards is essential in South Africa. As Neethling et al.¹¹ suggest, “by incorporating POCUS as part of our armamentarium, we might see it reach its full clinical potential, optimising patient care and improving patient outcomes”.

An important barrier to US as identified by our respondents was lack of US training at the postgraduate level. It is important to note that only 27.3% of respondents received US training as a registrar and 32.7% of respondents were self-trained. The latest published FCA curriculum (2014) does not mention US skills nor

competence required from a specialist trainee nor is there any formal logbook of US procedures required for qualification.¹² However, questions on POCUS do form a significant part of the final FCA exams. In this regard, there seems to be a gap in the current curriculum, suggesting that an updated curriculum incorporating POCUS skills is necessary. This is in contrast to The College of Emergency Medicine of South Africa (CEMSA) which has a credentialing procedure for emergency physicians or other clinicians who wish to perform emergency ultrasound in the emergency department for diagnostic purposes, or even as an adjunct in the placement of CVCs.¹³ Fellows of the CEMSA are expected to have both appropriate training and practical experience to perform and interpret basic emergency US examinations.

Mahmood et al.,¹⁴ representing a group of international experts in the fields of cardiothoracic, general and regional anaesthesiology, critical care and pain medicine, recommended that perioperative US training should be continuous and structured. They advocate that residency programmes should create their own teaching tools and evaluation metrics to demonstrate the progression of learners.

The findings of this study suggest that there is a need to incorporate US in the undergraduate curriculum. In a study evaluating training medical students, with no previous US experience to perform basic US-guided vascular access and basic FATE, Heiberg et al.¹⁵ showed that medical students were able to rapidly improve their skills from baseline with the use of an e-learning package and a four-hour hands-on session. It is believed that clinicians are more likely to incorporate US into their daily practice if it is introduced at an early stage of their careers.¹⁵

There are currently multiple different courses available for training in POCUS: FATE as previously mentioned, extended focused assessment with sonography for trauma (e-FAST), bedside lung ultrasound in emergency (BLUE), focused echocardiographic evaluation in life support (FEEL), focused intensive care echocardiography (FICE) and haemodynamic echocardiography examination in real time (HART), among many others.¹¹ All these have a similar goal, that is to provide a structure to non-cardiologist practitioners to diagnose or confirm a specific clinical cardiorespiratory emergency that is responsible for patient haemodynamic instability. POCUS is easily taught, non-invasive and readily available.¹¹ This study showed that 58.0% of the study respondents had US training through courses and workshops. Some respondents felt that there is a lack of awareness of POCUS benefits and courses available. By promoting access to these courses nationally and advocating the benefits, there may be more interest in completing these courses. This study did not evaluate which courses the survey respondents attended, but establishing which courses would be most useful for our context would be of value.

The assumption that a lack of availability of US equipment would be a major barrier to the use of POCUS in South Africa was

refuted as 68.8% of respondents had US readily available during daytime, and even more reported availability after hours (76.7%). Factors limiting use, such as limited numbers of machines being shared by multiple theatres during daytime hours, were not elucidated. The findings, however, suggest that using POCUS when indicated within a resource-limited setting is achievable and should be encouraged. South African anaesthetists, however, still perceived that one of the most important barriers to US was lack of equipment. There may be institutional logistical factors that could contribute to this perception. For example, US equipment being stored or locked away outside operation theatres and thus not readily accessible in an emergency setting. In solo private practice, surgical slate pressure and lack of peer support may also limit the use of POCUS.

Barriers that could be addressed in the promotion of more widespread US use include appropriate provision of equipment and increased formal training in order to improve competence and confidence.¹⁶ With improved skills and confidence in POCUS use, time spent performing exams becomes less of a factor. The importance of continued training and supervision should be emphasised for skill maintenance.

Although respondents indicated that they would like to use US, had the requisite training and generally had access to US equipment, respondents also indicated that the two most important barriers to POCUS use in South Africa were lack of equipment and lack of training at the postgraduate level. Other perceived barriers to POCUS use in South Africa were lack of training at undergraduate level, lack of POCUS courses nationally and lack of awareness of its benefits. Specific feedback from some respondents indicated that there are certain circumstances, such as pressure from surgical colleagues, that discourage an anaesthetist from gaining self-confidence in using US.

Study limitations

The response rate for this study was 22.9% among SASA members. Although the confidence interval of 3.9 is acceptable, the sample was self-selected, and given the fact that this was an online survey, there may have been selection bias by POCUS practitioners. Therefore, the results may underestimate the practice and availability of US among less enthusiastic users, or those with less access to US machines. Not all South African doctors who provide anaesthesia are registered with SASA, and some may not have received the invitation to participate in the survey. The results of this study may therefore not necessarily be generalisable to the entire country as smaller provinces were less represented. This study could also have been biased towards obtaining information from physicians with access to the internet, smart phone applications, WhatsApp accounts and an active email address. However, this was not expected to be a significant limitation, considering the general easy accessibility and widespread use of email and social media. Response rates to emailed or web-based surveys are comparable to a mailed hard copy survey.¹⁷

The researchers also did not survey the hospitals independently or cross-checked equipment availability with hospital and anaesthetic department management. Further, this study did not interrogate the availability of the different types of US equipment; for example, the different types of US probes available, portability of US machines, or the availability of special needles for regional anaesthesia. Importantly, one must not disregard the costs of US equipment and related disposables, which may be extremely relevant in a resource-limited setting like South Africa. Given the rapidly diminishing cost of small, handheld ultrasound machines, economics may be less of a factor in the acquisition of ultrasound devices in future.

Recommendations

A national audit of POCUS equipment for anaesthesia at hospitals would provide more insight into US equipment available for perioperative care. Comparing such information with clinical practice may truly reflect the uptake of POCUS among South African anaesthetists. We strongly recommend formalising POCUS in the FCA curriculum and the use of procedural logbooks for US procedures and skills as part of the FCA portfolio of learning. The use of ultrasound should be included from the outset of specialist training of anaesthetists and tested in the FCA OSCE exam, similar to the American Board of Anesthesiology (ABA) Applied exam.^{2,3} Making POCUS workshops or online modules more accessible will also increase training opportunities for anaesthetists, especially for those who do not work in major cities or centres. In addition, there must be ongoing emphasis and awareness about the benefits of POCUS in perioperative care, and opportunities must be afforded to anaesthetists to practice skills learnt under supervision.

Conclusion

US in the South African perioperative setting is common for CVC insertion and regional anaesthesia, but less frequent in relatively new applications such as cardiac and lung assessments, as well as peripheral vascular access and neuraxial anaesthesia. Ultrasound machine availability should not be a barrier to the widespread use of POCUS by local practitioners. South African anaesthetists are enthusiastic about upskilling themselves and introducing US more regularly into their practice. However, there may be some shortcomings in the current training standards and curricula that can potentially hinder further US adoption. A matched administrative effort at formalising US training, incorporating procedural logbooks in the FCA curriculum, and making US training or workshops more accessible with the input from The College of Anaesthetists of South Africa may assist in improving the fate of POCUS in our daily practice.

Acknowledgements

This research was endorsed by the SASA CEO Ms Natalie Zimmelman. We thank her for her encouragement. We also thank Mr Dawid van Straaten from ANSA/Safe Surgery SA for his assistance in setting up the REDCap survey database.

The authors are also grateful to Professor Bruce Biccand and Dr Richard Llewellyn for their invaluable writing and editing assistance.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding source

No funding was required.

Ethical approval

Ethical approval was obtained from the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of Cape Town (HREC 397/2020) prior to distribution of the questionnaire.

ORCID

MIS Kathrada  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6467-8898>

M Jagga  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1096-1182>

YN Mzoneli  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9772-3907>

J Swanevelder  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6986-4470>

MW Gibbs  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3283-2552>

References

- Chui J, Lavi R, Hegazy AF, et al. Identifying barriers to the use of ultrasound in the perioperative period: a survey of southwestern Ontario anesthesiologists. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2019;19:214. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-019-4040-2>.
- Pulton D, Feinman J. Hocus POCUS: making barriers to perioperative point-of-care ultrasound disappear. *Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth*. 2019;33:2419-20. <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.jvca.2019.05.028>.
- SASA Practice Guidelines 2018 Revision. *S Afr J Anaesth Analg*. 2018;24:S1-119.
- Guidance on the use of ultrasound locating devices for placing central venous catheters. National Institute for Health Care and Excellence [Internet]. 2002;49:1-32. Available from: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ta49/resources/guidance-on-the-use-of-ultrasound-locating-devices-for-placing-central-venous-catheters-pdf-2294585518021>. Accessed 6 Aug 2021.
- Lamperti M, Bodenham AR, Pittiruti M, et al. International evidence-based recommendations on ultrasound-guided vascular access. *Intensive Care Med*. 2012;38:1105-17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-012-2597-x>.
- Hansen MA, Juhl-Olsen P, Thorn S, Frederiksen CA, Sloth E. Ultrasonography-guided catheterization. *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand*. 2014;58:446-52. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aas.12299>.
- Neal JM, Brull R, Horn J, et al. The second American Society of Regional Anesthesia and Pain Medicine evidence-based medicine assessment of ultrasound-guided. *Reg Anesth Pain Med*. 2016;41(2):181-94. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AAP.0000000000000331>.
- White L, Halpin A, Turner M, Wallace L. Ultrasound-guided radial artery cannulation in adult and paediatric populations: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Anaesth*. 2016;116(5):610-7. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bja/aew097>.
- Ghosh S, Madjdpour C, Chin K. Ultrasound-guided lumbar central neuraxial block. *BJA Educ*. 2016;16(7):213-20. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjaed/mkv048>.
- Perlas A, Chaparro LE, Chin KJ. Lumbar neuraxial ultrasound for spinal and epidural anesthesia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Reg Anesth Pain Med*. 2016;41(2):251-60. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AAP.0000000000000184>.
- Neethling E, Roodt F, Beck C, Swanevelder JLC. Point-of-care and lung ultrasound incorporated in daily practice. *S Afr Med J*. 2018;108(5):376-81. <https://doi.org/10.7196/SAMJ.2018.v108i5.13313>.
- College of Anaesthetists of South Africa. Curriculum for trainees in anaesthesiology 2014. 2014;1-51.
- Wells M, Goldstein LN, Beringer C, Farham B. Emergency Medicine Society of South Africa guidelines for the training and credentialing in emergency point-of-care ultrasound. *S Afr Med J*. 2021;111(5b). <https://doi.org/10.7196/SAMJ.2021.v111i5b.15346>.
- Mahmood F, Matyal R, Skubas N, et al. Perioperative ultrasound training in anaesthesiology: a call to action. *Anesth Analg*. 2016;122(6):1794-804. <https://doi.org/10.1213/ANE.0000000000001134>.
- Heiberg J, Hansen LS, Wemmelund K, et al. Point-of-care clinical ultrasound for medical students. *Ultrasound Int Open*. 2015;1(2):E58-66. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0035-1565173>.
- Westcott GE, Morrell D. Ultrasonography in anaesthesia and intensive care: a mixed methods study of current clinical practice at a resource-constrained tertiary hospital in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa [unpublished dissertation, accepted MMed]. Mthatha: Walter Sisulu University; 2019. p. 1-84.
- Yetter G, Capaccioli K. Differences in responses to Web and paper surveys among school professionals. *Behav Res*. 2010;42:266-72. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.42.1.266>.

Supplementary File 1

| Institutional characteristics | Total (n = 571) | | Medical officers (n = 84) | | Registrars (n = 147) | | Consultants (n = 318) | | GP anaesthetists (n = 22) | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------|------------------------------|------|-------------------------|------|--------------------------|------|------------------------------|------|
| | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % | n | % |
| Level of hospital | | | | | | | | | | |
| District | 56 | 9.8 | 12 | 14.3 | 18 | 12.2 | 22 | 6.9 | 4 | 18.2 |
| Regional | 171 | 29.9 | 39 | 46.4 | 32 | 38.1 | 87 | 27.4 | 13 | 59.1 |
| Tertiary | 442 | 77.7 | 44 | 52.4 | 144 | 98.0 | 244 | 76.7 | 10 | 45.5 |
| No of operating rooms | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1–3 | 18 | 3.2 | 3 | 3.6 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 40.9 | 2 | 9.1 |
| 4–10 | 245 | 42.9 | 68 | 81.0 | 25 | 17.0 | 139 | 43.7 | 13 | 59.1 |
| ≥ 10 | 308 | 53.9 | 13 | 15.5 | 122 | 83.0 | 166 | 52.2 | 7 | 31.8 |
| No of US machines for perioperative care | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 13 | 2.8 | 1 | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3.14 | 2 | 9.1 |
| 1 | 176 | 30.8 | 40 | 47.6 | 7 | 4.8 | 113 | 35.5 | 16 | 72.7 |
| 2 | 134 | 23.5 | 29 | 34.5 | 27 | 18.3 | 75 | 23.6 | 3 | 13.6 |
| 3 | 64 | 11.2 | 10 | 11.9 | 17 | 11.6 | 37 | 11.6 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 58 | 10.2 | 1 | 1.2 | 28 | 19.0 | 29 | 9.1 | 0 | 0 |
| ≥ 5 | 126 | 22.1 | 3 | 3.6 | 68 | 46.3 | 54 | 17.0 | 1 | 4.5 |
| US readily available during daytime (07h00–17h00) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 393 | 68.8 | 64 | 76.2 | 91 | 61.9 | 229 | 72.0 | 9 | 40.9 |
| Sometimes | 152 | 26.6 | 18 | 21.4 | 47 | 31.9 | 79 | 24.8 | 8 | 36.4 |
| No (locked away/special authorisation) | 26 | 4.6 | 2 | 23.8 | 9 | 6.1 | 10 | 31.4 | 5 | 22.7 |
| US readily available after hours and weekends | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 438 | 76.7 | 66 | 78.6 | 122 | 83.0 | 240 | 74.5 | 10 | 45.5 |
| Sometimes | 87 | 15.2 | 10 | 11.9 | 15 | 10.2 | 56 | 17.6 | 6 | 27.2 |
| No (locked away/special authorisation) | 46 | 8.1 | 8 | 9.5 | 10 | 6.8 | 22 | 6.9 | 6 | 27.2 |
| US is common practice for cardiac assessments | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 188 | 32.9 | 11 | 13.1 | 79 | 53.7 | 92 | 28.9 | 6 | 27.2 |
| Sometimes | 172 | 30.1 | 40 | 47.6 | 47 | 32.0 | 119 | 37.4 | 5 | 22.7 |
| No | 211 | 36.9 | 33 | 39.2 | 21 | 14.3 | 107 | 33.6 | 11 | 50.0 |
| US is common practice for lung assessments | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 78 | 13.7 | 8 | 9.5 | 42 | 28.6 | 27 | 8.5 | 1 | 4.5 |
| Sometimes | 220 | 38.5 | 25 | 29.8 | 73 | 49.7 | 119 | 37.4 | 3 | 13.6 |
| No | 273 | 47.8 | 51 | 60.7 | 32 | 21.8 | 172 | 54.1 | 18 | 81.8 |
| US is common practice for regional anaesthesia | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 475 | 83.2 | 71 | 84.5 | 139 | 94.6 | 253 | 79.6 | 12 | 54.5 |
| Sometimes | 72 | 12.6 | 9 | 10.7 | 5 | 3.4 | 53 | 16.7 | 5 | 22.7 |
| No | 24 | 4.2 | 4 | 4.8 | 3 | 2.0 | 12 | 37.7 | 5 | 22.7 |
| US is common practice for neuraxial (spinals/epidurals) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 36 | 6.3 | 7 | 8.3 | 10 | 6.8 | 19 | 6.0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sometimes | 87 | 15.2 | 8 | 9.5 | 21 | 14.3 | 54 | 17.0 | 4 | 18.2 |
| No | 448 | 78.4 | 69 | 82.1 | 116 | 78.9 | 245 | 77.0 | 18 | 81.8 |
| US is common practice for CVC insertions | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 447 | 78.2 | 67 | 79.8 | 131 | 89.1 | 240 | 75.5 | 9 | 40.9 |
| Sometimes | 93 | 16.3 | 11 | 13.1 | 16 | 10.9 | 59 | 18.6 | 7 | 31.8 |
| No | 31 | 5.4 | 6 | 7.1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 59.7 | 6 | 27.2 |
| US is common practice for difficult A-line insertions | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 283 | 49.5 | 37 | 44.0 | 85 | 57.8 | 154 | 48.4 | 7 | 31.8 |
| Sometimes | 205 | 35.9 | 31 | 36.9 | 45 | 30.6 | 121 | 38.1 | 8 | 36.3 |
| No | 83 | 14.5 | 16 | 19.0 | 17 | 11.6 | 43 | 13.5 | 7 | 31.8 |
| US is common practice for difficult peripheral line insertions | | | | | | | | | | |
| Yes | 153 | 26.8 | 14 | 16.7 | 59 | 40.3 | 80 | 25.2 | 0 | 0 |
| Sometimes | 219 | 38.4 | 35 | 41.7 | 59 | 40.3 | 115 | 36.2 | 10 | 45.5 |
| No | 199 | 34.9 | 35 | 41.7 | 29 | 19.7 | 123 | 38.7 | 12 | 54.5 |



UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN
Faculty of Health Sciences
Human Research Ethics Committee



Room G50- Old Main Building
Groote Schuur Hospital
Observatory 7925
Telephone [021] 406 6492
Email: hrec-enquiries@uct.ac.za
Website: www.health.uct.ac.za/fhs/research/humanethics/forms

27 July 2020

HREC REF: 397/2020

Dr M Gibbs

Division of Anaesthesia & Perioperative Medicine
Ward D -23 NGSB
Email: Matthew.gibbs@uct.ac.za
Student: kthmoh001@myuct.ac.za

Dear Dr Gibbs

PROJECT TITLE: BARRIERS AND LIMITATIONS TO PERI-OPERATIVE ULTRASOUND USE IN SOUTH AFRICAN ANAESTHETISTS: A SURVEY OF CURRENT PRACTICE AND AVAILABILITY- MASTERS CANDIDATE-DR MOHAMMAD IS KATHRADA

Thank you for your response addressing the issues raised by the Faculty of Health Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC).

It is a pleasure to inform you that the HREC has **formally approved** the above-mentioned study.

This approval is subject to strict adherence to the HREC recommendations regarding research involving human participants during COVID -19, dated 17 March 2020 and 06 July 2020.

Approval is granted for one year until the 30 July 2021.

Please submit a progress form, using the standardised Annual Report Form if the study continues beyond the approval period. Please submit a Standard Closure form if the study is completed within the approval period.

(Forms can be found on our website: www.health.uct.ac.za/fhs/research/humanethics/forms)

The HREC acknowledge that the student: - Dr Mohammad Kathrada will also be Involved In this study.

Please quote the HREC REF in all your correspondence.

Please note that the ongoing ethical conduct of the study remains the responsibility of the principal Investigator.

Please note that for all studies approved by the HREC, the principal investigator **must** obtain appropriate institutional approval, where necessary, before the research may occur.

Yours sincerely


PROFESSOR M BLOCKMAN
CHAIRPERSON, FHS HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

Federal Wide Assurance Number: FWA00001637.
Institutional Review Board (IRB) number: IRB00001938
NHREC-registration number: REC-210208-007

This serves to confirm that the University of Cape Town Human Research Ethics Committee complies to the Ethics Standards for Clinical Research with a new drug in patients, based on the Medical Research Council (MRC-SA), Food and Drug Administration (FDA-USA), International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use: Good Clinical Practice (ICH GCP), South African Good Clinical Practice Guidelines (DoH 2006), based on the Association of the British Pharmaceutical Industry Guidelines (ABPI), and Declaration of Helsinki (2013) guidelines. The Human Research Ethics Committee granting this approval is in compliance with the ICH Harmonised Tripartite Guidelines E6: Note for Guidance on Good Clinical Practice (CPMP/ICH/135/95) and FDA Code Federal Regulation Part 50, 56 and 312.



Form FHS010: Study Closure Report

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----------|
| HREC office use only (FWA00001637; IRB00001938) | | | |
| Noted and filed. This serves as acknowledgement that this study is closed. | | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approved | Study closure report | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not Approved | Study closure report | | |
| Chairperson of the HREC signature/Designee |  | Date | 11/8/2021 |


Note: Please note that incomplete submissions will not be reviewed.

Please email this form and supporting documents (if applicable) in a combined pdf-file to hrec-enquiries@uct.ac.za.

Please clarify your plan for research-related activities during COVID-19 lockdown

1. Principal Investigator to complete the following:

| | |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Date (when submitting this form) | 26/07/2021 |
| HREC REF Number | HREC Ref : 397/2020 |
| Protocol Title | Barriers and Limitations to Peri-operative Ultrasound Use in South African Anaesthetists: A survey of current practice and availability. |
| Protocol number (if applicable) | N/A |
| Principal Investigator | Dr Matthew Gibbs |
| Department / Office Internal Mail Address | Matthew.Gibbs@uct.ac.za |



2. Please confirm (tick ✓)

| | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| This study is closed to enrollment | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Participants have completed all research-related interventions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Participants have completed all research-related follow-up | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Data analysis is complete | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |



| | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Your sponsored protocol is closed | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| If you answered 'no' to any of the above questions, you must keep your study open until all research activity is completed. | | |



3. What is the reason for closing the study? (tick ✓)

| | | | |
|------------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|
| Research completed | ✓ | No time | |
| Terminated due to toxicity/adverse event | | PI left UCT or affiliated sites | |
| Slow accrual | | Insufficient funding | |
| Loss of interest | | Research never began | |
| Other. Please specify: | | | |
| | | | |

4. For clinical trials, please describe the arrangements for provision of care after research, including (where applicable) post-trial access to the investigational product.

N/A

5. Please explain how the research findings have been disseminated to participants, communities, and/or stakeholders.

The research findings has been presented at the UCT Department of Anaesthesia Annual Research Day on the 20th November 2021.

The research project and findings have been written up as an Original Research Project, and submitted to the South African Journal of Anaesthesia and Analgesia for publication. It is currently being reviewed and assessed for publication.



6. Please confirm (tick ✓)

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Have you submitted a final report to the Provincial Health Research Committee? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------|

Please note: Researchers must submit final reports to the relevant research co-ordinator/research directorate at City Health Department, GSH, RXH, TBH, PGWC (for non-tertiary hospitals) within six months of completion of the study and may be required to report the findings of the study to other relevant authorities including the PHRC.

7. Please indicate how, and for how long, the data will be stored and protected.

All the survey data has been securely stored on a password protected REDCAP database and kept strictly confidential. The data will be retained for no less than 2 years on the server, and 7 years in encrypted cloud backup, in keeping with FDA and GCP recommendations, respectively.

8. Please list or attach any papers, abstracts, presentations or other outputs generated from this study.

Please find attached

- Manuscript as submitted to the South African Journal of Anaesthesia and Analgesia
- Powerpoint Slides of the Research findings, as presented on the UCT Department of Anaesthesia Annual Research Day on the 20th November 2020.

9. Signatures

| | | | |
|-----------------|--|------|------------|
| Signature of PI | | Date | 26/07/2021 |
|-----------------|--|------|------------|

Appendix 1: Initial Questionnaire (Pilot Survey)

Participants Characteristics

1. SASA member:

Yes

No

2. Age group

20-29

30-39

40-49

50-59

60-69

>69

3. Gender

Male

Female

Prefer not to answer

4. Anaesthesia Qualifications (or equivalent)

DA

FCA

Subspecialist

Other (Specify..)

None

5. Designation

Medical Officer

Registrar

Consultant

GP Anaesthetist

6. Years of practice in Anaesthesia

Less than 2 years

2-5 years

6-10 years

10-20 years

Over 20 years

7. Employment

Full time

Part time

8. Sector

State Hospital

Private Hospital

Both

9. Level of Hospital(tick all that apply if multiple sites)

- District
- Regional
- Tertiary /Central

10. Province

- Gauteng
- KZN
- Eastern Cape
- Western Cape
- Free State
- Northern Cape
- North-West Province
- Limpopo
- Mpumalanga

Institution Characteristics (this is the institution at which you perform the majority of your work)

1. No of operating rooms
 - 1-3
 - 4-9
 - >10
2. No. of ultrasound machines designated for perioperative care at your institution
 - 0
 - 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5 or more
3. Ultrasound machine is readily available when I need them during day time (0700 – 1700)
 - Yes
 - Sometimes
 - No (eg locked away or special authorization only)
4. Ultrasound machine is readily available when I need them during after hours (1700 – 0700) and weekends
 - Yes
 - Sometimes
 - No (e.g. locked away or special authorization only)
5. In your institution, is the use of ultrasound common practice for central line insertion?
 - Yes
 - Sometimes
 - No
6. In your institution, is the use of ultrasound common practice for regional blocks?
 - Yes
 - Sometimes
 - No

7. In your institution, is the use of ultrasound common for difficult A-Line placement?

Yes

Sometimes

No

Participants' Practice

1. I use ultrasound guidance when inserting a central line

Always

Frequently

Sometimes

Seldom

Never

2. I use ultrasound guidance for arterial cannulation

Always

Frequently

Sometimes

Seldom

Never

3. I use ultrasound guidance when performing regional blocks

Always

Frequently

Sometimes

Seldom

Never

4. I use ultrasound guidance for spinal and epidural blocks

Always

Frequently

Sometimes

Seldom

Never

5. I use ultrasound for heart and lung assessments whenever indicated

Always

Frequently

Sometimes

Seldom

Never

Training preference

1. I have received training in Perioperative Ultrasound use (choose all applicable)

- None
- Registrar training
- Fellowship training
- Peer-to-peer training
- Workshop(s) (eg FATE, CRUSE)
- Self-trained

2. I would like to receive ultrasound training

- Yes
- No
- Maybe

3. I plan to undertake ultrasound training

- Yes
- No
- Maybe

4. I am NOT planning to undertake ultrasound training because (tick all relevant)

- I have sufficient training
- Training is not available easily in my institution
- It is not needed in my practice
- I have no interest in Ultrasound training
- I do not see the benefit in ultrasound training

5. Ultrasound guidance is an important skill for all anaesthetists

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Participants Characteristics

1. SASA member:

Yes

No

2. Age group

20-29

30-39

40-49

50-59

60-69

>69

3. Gender

Male

Female

Prefer not to answer

4. Anaesthesia Qualifications (or equivalent)

DA

FCA

Subspecialist

Other (Specify...)

None

5. Designation

Medical Officer

Registrar

Consultant

GP Anaesthetist

6. Years of practice in Anaesthesia

Less than 2 years

2-5 years

6-10 years

10-20 years

Over 20 years

7. Employment

Full time

Part time

8. Sector

State Hospital

Private Hospital

Both

9. Level of Hospital(tick all that apply if multiple sites)

- District
- Regional
- Tertiary /Central

10. Province

- Gauteng
- KZN
- Eastern Cape
- Western Cape
- Free State
- Northern Cape
- North-West Province
- Limpopo
- Mpumalanga

Institution Characteristics (this is the institution at which you perform the majority of your work)

1. No of operating rooms
 - 1-3
 - 4-9
 - >10
2. No. of ultrasound machines designated for perioperative care at your institution
 - 0
 - 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5 or more
3. Ultrasound machine is readily available when I need them during day time (0700 – 1700)
 - Yes
 - Sometimes
 - No (e.g. locked away or special authorization only)
4. Ultrasound machine is readily available when I need them during after hours (1700 – 0700) and weekends
 - Yes
 - Sometimes
 - No (e.g. locked away or special authorization only)
5. In your institution, is the use of ultrasound common practice for cardiac assessment?
 - Yes
 - Sometimes
 - No
6. In your institution, is the use of ultrasound common practice for point-of-care lung assessment?
 - Yes
 - Sometimes
 - No

7. In your institution, is the use of ultrasound common practice for neuraxial procedures(spinals and epidurals)?
Yes
Sometimes
No
8. In your institution, is the use of ultrasound common practice for central line insertion?
Yes
Sometimes
No
9. In your institution, is the use of ultrasound common practice for regional blocks?
Yes
Sometimes
No
10. In your institution, is the use of ultrasound common for difficult A-Line placement?
Yes
Sometimes
No
11. In your institution, is the use of ultrasound common for difficult peripheral line placement?
Yes
Sometimes
No

Participants' Practice

1. I use Point of Care Ultrasound (POCUS) for (select all that apply)
Cardiac Assessments
Lung Assessments
Peripheral Line Insertion
Central Line Insertion
Arterial Line Insertion
Neuraxial Anaesthesia (Spinals and epidurals)
Regional Anaesthesia
None of the above
2. I use ultrasound guidance when inserting a central line
Always
Frequently
Sometimes
Seldom
Never

3. I use ultrasound guidance for arterial cannulation

- Always
- Frequently
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never

4. I use ultrasound guidance for difficult Peripheral Line Insertion

- Always
- Frequently
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never

5. I use ultrasound guidance when performing regional blocks

- Always
- Frequently
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never

6. I use ultrasound guidance for spinal and epidural blocks

- Always
- Frequently
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never

7. I use ultrasound for cardiac assessments whenever indicated

- Always
- Frequently
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never

8. I use ultrasound for lung assessments whenever indicated

- Always
- Frequently
- Sometimes
- Seldom
- Never

Training preference

1. I feel confident in my Point of Care Ultrasound (POCUS) skills
 - Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neutral
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree

2. I have received training in Perioperative Ultrasound use (choose all applicable)
 - None
 - Registrar training
 - Fellowship training
 - Peer-to-peer training
 - Workshop(s) (e.g. FATE, CRUSE)
 - Self-trained

3. Is there a colleague with whom you can review your Point of Care Ultrasound (POCUS) findings if needed?
 - Always
 - Frequently
 - Sometimes
 - Seldom
 - Never

4. I would like to receive ultrasound training
 - Yes
 - No
 - Maybe

5. I plan to undertake ultrasound training within the next year
 - Yes
 - No
 - Maybe

6. I am NOT planning to undertake ultrasound training because (tick all relevant)
 - I have sufficient training
 - Training is not available easily in my institution
 - It is not needed in my practice
 - I have no interest in Ultrasound training
 - I do not see the benefit in ultrasound training

7. If you plan to undertake training, in what format should the training be? (Tick all that apply)
 - Hands-on Workshop(s) (e.g. FATE, CRUSE)
 - Online workshops/Webinars
 - Formal Fellowship training
 - Peer-to-peer training within your institution
 - Self-trained

8. Ultrasound guidance is an important skill for all anaesthetists

Strongly agree

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Strongly disagree

9. The most important barrier to POCUS use in South African hospitals by Anaesthetists is:

Lack of equipment

Lack of training at undergraduate level

Lack of training at postgraduate level

Lack of awareness of POCUS benefits

Lack of national POCUS courses

Limited access to equipment after hours

10. The NEXT most important barrier is:

Lack of equipment

Lack of training at undergraduate level

Lack of training at postgraduate level

Lack of awareness of POCUS benefits

Lack of national POCUS courses

Limited access to equipment after hours