Introduction: The number of children with developmental language delay is growing. But the isolated use of speech therapy doesn't always help to improve the long-term prognosis. It was found that developmental language delay is almost never the only violation of a child.

Objectives: To develop the prevention program of emotional and behavioral disorders in children with developmental language delay.

Methods: 100 children with developmental language delay (70 boys; Mage= 26.9 months, SD = 5.5) and 50 children with typical language development were studied by clinical follow-up method. The clinical method was supplemented by the Bayley Scale, the Language Development Survey and the Child Behavior Checklist $1\frac{1}{2}$ -5.

Results: A comprehensive children examination revealed developmental language delay risk factors, the psychomotor profile of the children, and the types of emotional and behavioral impairments, which were determined by us as: emotionally labile, emotionally detached and oppositional. The presence of subclinical disorders symptoms in children makes it necessary to carry out preventive measures. The primary prevention consists of pregnancy planning, effective care in pregnancy and childbirth. The secondary prevention aims to early diagnosis of developmental language delay, risk factors assessment of emotional and behavioral disorders and effective methods application of language and psychomotor development correction. Tertiary prevention have to individualized solves the children problems in accordance with revealed types of emotional and behavioral impairments. But the most important part is psychoeducation (special courses for parents and children with developmental language delay).

Conclusions: The prevention program was developed to prevent numerous psychiatric problems in childhood and adolescence.

Disclosure: No significant relationships.

Keywords: prevention; emotional impairments; behavioral impairments; psychoeducation

EPP0299

Factors Affecting School Performance in the Adolescents of USA- Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System

M. Chahal¹, M. Telsem², B. Das³*, S. Patel⁴, S. Gadiwala⁵, R. Stuart⁶, A. Mistry⁷, T. Satnarine⁸, P. Singla⁹, A. Bakarr¹⁰, P. Sharma¹¹, Y.-C. Hsieh¹², K. Aedma¹³, S. Patel¹⁴ and R. Pathrose¹⁵

 ¹Government Medical College, Department Of Psychiatry, Chandigarh, India; ²Fulton State Hospital, Department Of Psychiatry, Fulton, United States of America; ³Central New York Psychiatric center, Forensic Psychiatry, Marcy, United States of America;
⁴Government Medical College,Surat, Department Of Paediatrics, Surat, India; ⁵B J Medical College,Ahmedabad, Department Of Pediatrics, Ahmedabad, India; ⁶Poznan University of Medical Science, Psychiatry, Poznań, Poland; ⁷Dr N D Desai Medical College and Research Centre, Pediatrics, Nadiad, India; ⁸Port of Spain General Hospital, Neonatology, Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago; ⁹Government Medical College, Patiala, Paediatrics, Panchkula, India; ¹⁰St George's University school of Medicine, Medicine, True blue, Grenada; ¹¹Government Medical College, Amritsar, Department Of Psychiatry, Amritsar, India; ¹²Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, School Of Public Health, New York City, United States of America; ¹³UnityPoint Unitypoint Clinic Psychiatry, Department Of Psychiatry, Peoria, United States of America; ¹⁴University of Illinois, Paediatrics, Chicago, United States of America and ¹⁵Indiana University Memorial Health Ball Hospital, Department Of Psychiatry, Muncie, United States of America

*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2022.587

Introduction: Poor academic performance has been linked to factors such as sleep, health, illicit drug use, physical fighting, social media use, cyber bullying, physical activity, homelessness, times spent in video games and television. It is difficult to get a sense of the interplay between and relative importance of different behaviours/ factors on academic performance as only limited research has been aimed at quantifying these factors.

Objectives: To evaluate association of school performance and variables in five categories of the YRBSS: physical fighting, diet/lifestyle, electronic device usage, concurrent substance use, and violence/self-harm.

Methods: The CDC Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS) data from 1991-2019 was used in study. Respondents were grouped by good and poor school performance and variables related to nutrition/lifestyle, electronic device use, concurrent substance use, mood/violence/self-harm were analyzed using chi-square test.

Results: A total of 41,235 student respondents.Nutrition/Lifestyle, electronic device use, concurrent substance use, mood/violence/ self-harm are found to be significantly correlated with school performance.

	Poor Performance n(%)	Good Performance n(%)	Total n(%)	p-Value
Nutrition/Lifestyle				
Daily breakfast	2,715(26)	11,429(38.22)	14,144(35.06)	<0.0001
Sodas ≥2/day	1,998(19.12)	2,710(9.03)	4,708(11.63)	<0.0001
Concurrent Substance Use				
Alcohol use	3,544(37.55)	8,067(28.49)	11,611(30.75)	<0.0001
Cigarette smoking	1,616(15.74)	1,845(6.17)	3,461(8.61)	<0.0001
Mood/Violence/Self- Harm				
Difficulty concentrating	4,188(46.34)	7,327(28.27)	11,516(32.94)	<0.0001
Felt sad or hopeless	4,373(41.06)	9,038(29.67)	13,410(32.62)	<0.0001
Considered suicide	2,567(24.14)	4,810(15.8)	7,377(17.96)	<0.0001

Conclusions: In national data, we found school performance is affected by nutrition, lifestyle, substance use, mood and exposure to surrounding violence, and self-harm. Further studies should be planned to evaluate benefits from the risk stratification to reduce this burden amongst US adolescents.

Disclosure: No significant relationships.

Keywords: School Performance; Adolescents; mood and environment; diet and nutrition