A How-To Toolkit for Teaching Residents Common Musculoskeletal Injections Performed in Primary Care



UNIVERSITY of HOUSTON

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE

Elizabeth A. Suniega, MD, FAAFP & Anush S. Pillai, DO, FAAFP

Background

- Musculoskeletal concerns are very commonly encountered in primary care, & can account for nearly 20% of appointments annually¹
- Musculoskeletal injections are a key diagnostic & therapeutic tool that can be offered to adult patients in outpatient settings
- Common indications for steroid injections with local anesthetics include osteoarthritis, bursitis, & tenosynovitis



- Many learners are interested in performing these procedures, but feel uncomfortable about offering them due to a lack of training, insufficient experience, &/or concerns about litigation
- These services can be simple to perform, significantly augment practice revenue through appropriate billing & coding measures, as well as add provider-patient satisfaction
- Educational workshops that integrate simulation trainers represent an easy & safe way to improve learner comfort & competence in these procedures, which can be performed in a Primary Care Physician's (PCPs) office

Objective

- Demonstrate an approach to creating & teaching an effective joint injection workshop that can improve a learner's confidence & comfort level
- Share foundational tools that can be utilized to tailor the development of future workshops & optimize quality

Discussion

- Every learner found the injection workshop to be educationally beneficial
- Average % confidence markedly improved post-workshop with relation to: 1) identifying patient candidates, 2) performing informed consent, 3) identifying anatomic landmarks, & 4) performing joint injections, & remained at least 15% higher than baseline at 3 months post-workshop

Conclusion

- Musculoskeletal injection workshops can result in a sustained improvement in self-reported learner comfort & knowledge regarding these procedures
- A standardized approach to patient selection, landmark identification on both simulation models & other learners, as well as providing structured guidance on procedural technique can improve provider comfort & patient safety

improvement

Materials & Methods

- Developed a 180-minute joint injection workshop focusing on shoulder, wrist/hand, & knee joints that was presented by 2 Family Medicine faculty physicians during a resident didactic session to 15 Family Medicine residents
- Discussed indications & contraindications for joint injections & aspirations, components of informed consent, required equipment, as well as billing & coding
- Instructors educated learners about anatomic landmarks & proper techniques, demonstrated joint injections on simulated models, advised learners to palpate anatomic landmarks on the models & 5 other learners as well as demonstrate their techniques, & then they verified each of the learner's displayed landmarks & techniques
- Created a performance checklist with 20 critical tasks & a performance scoring guide to evaluate competency, as well as pre-workshop, post-workshop, & 3-month post-workshop surveys to assess self-reported learner confidence

- This trend seems to reflect that the learners found the training to be persistently meaningful & clinically relevant
- It could possibly be enriched in the future by offering subsequent joint injection workshops (e.g. – on a quarterly basis) & encouraging learners to more proactively offer this important diagnostic & therapeutic tool to patients with indications for its use while being precepted in clinic
- Average % confidence/interest in learning about joint injections remained > 60% both post-workshop & at 3 months post-workshop
- This finding may potentially be attributed to learners enjoying the educational content & retaining the majority of the information gleaned from the joint injection workshop
- It can be further evaluated during future workshops by developing more targeted questions with relation to learning about joint injections on both the post-workshop and 3 month post-workshop surveys
- Data interpretation may be limited by a relatively small sample size of learners, as well as dependence on self-

- This improvement in provider comfort can lead to a reduction in specialist consults & patient cost, as well as an expansion of services provided at a PCPs office & increase in a PCPs revenue
- The further development of future workshops is needed in order to create processes to assess learner competency

References

- Grunfeld R, Banks S, Fox E, et al. An Assessment of Musculoskeletal Knowledge in Graduating Medical and Physician Assistant Students and Implications for Musculoskeletal Care Providers. Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. 2012; 94(4): 343-348.
- 2. Seifert MK, Holt CT, Haskins A, Dexter W. Improving Internal Medicine Resident Comfort with Shoulder & Knee Joint Injections Using an Injection Workshop. *MedEdPORTAL*. 2020; 16:10979.
- 3. Barilla-Labarca ML, Tsang JC, Goldsmith M, Furie R. Design, Implementation, & Outcome of a Hands-On Arthocentesis Workshop. Journal of Clinical Rheumatology. 2009; 15(6): 275-279.
- 4. Jolly M, Hill A, Mataria M, Agarwal S. Influence of an Interactive Joint Model Injection Workshop on Physician's Musculoskeletal Procedural

Surveys inquired about % comfort in identifying candidates for joint injections, providing informed consent, locating anatomic landmarks, & performing injections; as well as interest in learning more about joint injections at 0/25/50/75/100% intervals

• 13 of 15 learners anonymously completed each of the 3 surveys, & data was analyzed (please see tables)

reported survey responses

• May consider making each of the 3 surveys non-anonymous during future workshops in order to more definitively track data-related trends

This research was supported (in whole or in part) by HCA Healthcare and/or an HCA Healthcare affiliated entity. The views expressed in this publication represent those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official views of HCA Healthcare or any of its affiliated entities.

Skills. Journal of Rheumatology. 2007; 34:1576-1579.

Healthcare