



Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.

**58** WITHDRAWN



**59** **Forced Evolution: Emergency Medicine Match Advising During COVID-19**



Camejo M, Estes M, Shandro J, Chandra S, Moffett S/University of Missouri-Kansas City/Truman Medical Center (UMKC/TMC), Kansas City, Missouri, Loma Linda University, University of Washington, Thomas Jefferson University, University Hospital-Newark

**Study Objectives:** The COVID-19 pandemic impacted advisors and students participating in the emergency medicine (EM) 2020-21 National Resident Matching Program cycle. Students were removed from clinical experiences, barred from away rotations, left struggling to obtain Standard Letters of Evaluation (SLOE), and forced to interview virtually and make rank lists without visiting programs. Advisors struggled to provide effective advice with constantly evolving institutional and national guidelines while living through and working in the public health crisis. The primary objective of this study was to analyze advising patterns of EM advisors for EM-bound students during the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Methods:** A 31-item survey with quantitative and qualitative questions was designed using an iterative process by a varied group of student advisors in the Council of Residency Directors (CORD) Advising Students Committee for EM (ASC-EM). This survey was distributed via the CORD list-serve during March 2021 to EM advisors (including program directors, assistant/associate program directors, clerkship directors and faculty advisors).

**Results:** We analyzed 97 unique responses. Despite the need to convert to virtual learning, a majority of advisors (73.3%) did not recommend taking an online virtual EM away rotation. The majority of EM bound students obtained one SLOE (75%). 20% of advisors reported that compared to prior years they recommended more students to dual apply. 31% of respondents reported being unsure how many interviews their lower-third candidates received, while only 17% were unsure how many their upper-third candidates received. Respondents providing qualitative responses on the challenges of advising reported significant stressors of the novel uncertainty of the process (43.2%), the challenges of decreased in-person time with advisees (27%), the stress of balancing personal and professional responsibilities (16.2%), and SLOE-related stress (13.5%). 100% of advisors reported that EM educational blogs such as EMRA (Emergency Medicine Residents' Association), SAEM (Society of Academic Emergency Medicine), and CORD guided how they advised students and all recommended students use those resources.

**Conclusion:** The pandemic created unique advising challenges. Despite uncertainty in how to guide students, advisors were able to provide largely cohesive recommendations aligned with national consensus recommendations from EM organizations. Students also seemed to adhere to these recommendations, particularly in terms of obtaining a single SLOE. Advisors reported variation on clarity about how many interviews their students had received, specifically knowing less about their less competitive students. Our survey raises some concern for significant stressors faced by advisors, but most respondents were able to draw on a unified larger EM community for support in their advising roles. This study highlights just one aspect of a unique year faced by our specialty.

**60** **Presence and Degree of Neutralizing Antibody Production Following Pfizer-BioNTech Vaccination**



Pepe PE, Antevy PM, Marty AM, Jui J, Cabral M, Rosenberg L, Schepke KA/Coral Springs / Parkland Fire Department, Broward Sheriff's Office, Dallas County Fire Rescue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, Coral Springs / Parkland Fire Department, Davie Fire Rescue and Palm Beach County Fire Rescue, Coral Springs, Florida, Florida International University, Miami, Florida, Oregon Health & Science University, Memorial Healthcare System and Joe DiMaggio Children's Hospital, Hollywood, Florida, Coral Springs / Parkland Fire Department, Coral Springs, Florida, Florida Department of Health, Tallahassee, Florida

**Study Objectives:** While almost all adults vaccinated with the SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine become positive for the IgG antibody (Ab) targeting the spike protein of SARS-CoV-2 within a week of their second dose, correlates of protection for SARS-CoV-2 are not fully understood. Therefore, the primary purpose of this study was to attempt to quantify the percentage of SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies (nAb) that develop after dose 2 vaccinations and also identify any factors that might affect the timing and degree of nAb production.

**Methods:** A fluorescence immunoassay analyzer was used to quantify the percent of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies capable of blocking the spike protein at its receptor

binding domain (RBD) for attachment to ACE-2 receptors. Seventy residents and staff of an assisted living facility ranging in age from 23 to 100 years were enrolled. Fingertick blood samples were measured at seven days and 21 days following the 2nd dose of the Pfizer-BioNTech mRNA vaccine. Based on prior research, nAb measurements <30% were considered to be inadequate protection and therefore delineated as nAb negative.

**Results:** Except for a 58 year old (yo) man taking daily prednisone for asthma and another 55 yo man with hypothyroidism (treated with levothyroxine), 100% of the 34 persons <70 were positive for neutralizing Ab (assays with >30% nAb) on day 7 after the 2nd vaccine dose. However, among the 37 patients older than 70 years, the percent of persons positive for nAb (>30%) on Day 7 diminished with age. Only half of those 71-80 yo, 33% of those 81-90 yo and 11% of those >90 yo were positive for nAb. Two weeks later, however, the percentages among those tested had increased to 83%, 71%, and 50% for those respective age groups. Also, one week after the second vaccine dose, the average neutralizing Ab% measurement (%nAb) among the various age groups under the age of 50 years ranged from 95 to 100% while age group averages were borderline or inadequate for those older than 70 years. Nevertheless, 21 days after the second dose, the average %nAb measurement had become 91% for those 61 to 70 years of age, 75% for those 71-80, and 55% for those 81-90. For the eight persons over 90 years of age, the average %nAb was 35% and half of those persons (n=4) had no detectable nAb, either at day 7 or day 21. No persons had significant declines in the %nAb measurements and the majority sustained or improved their %nAb between Day 7 and Day 21.

**Conclusions:** Escalating age and immunomodulating medications and conditions can impact the timing and degree of neutralizing Ab produced following SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccination. Most persons under the age of 90 years were considered to be "positive" for protective levels of nAb within three weeks following the 2nd dose of the SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine. On-going investigations involve evaluations of the duration and sustained degree of positive nAb findings, as well as external validation of the tool used in this current research.

**61** **Academic Impact on Emergency Medicine Training Programs During COVID-19 Pandemic**



Waseem M, Wang J, Shariff M, Asad H, Josephson E/Lincoln Medical Center, Bronx, New York

**Background:** Rapid spread of the Novel Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) resulted in a global pandemic. As front-line health care workers, this crisis significantly affected emergency medicine residents and their respective programs. We sought to explore the impact of COVID-19 on the education and training of emergency medicine residents across the United States and Puerto Rico.

**Methods:** A survey was sent out to Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) accredited United States and Puerto Rico emergency medicine residency programs (264 programs at the time) via email correspondence to the Program Directors and the Program Coordinators. The survey stratified program type (practice setting, length of training, institution type, moonlighting allowed) and impact of COVID-19 on residents (off-service rotations, weekly conferences, effect on research, and resident wellness initiatives). Comparison was made by United States and Puerto Rico regions divided by Northeast, South, Midwest, and West, as these closely correlated with the differences in areas of COVID-19 spread and saturation. REDCap was used as the platform for data capture.

**Results:** A total of 134 emergency medicine residency programs completed the survey. Northeast (44%), South (26%), Midwest (17%) and West (13%) programs by regions were reviewed. Overall, the majority of programs were in an urban setting (70%), and academic practice comprised 58%, followed by community at 40% (p=NS). The curriculum was a 3-year format for 71% of the programs (p=0.002). Overall half of the programs stated their institution was declared a site of pandemic emergency status by the ACGME, with 70% in Northeast and 39% of the Midwest, followed by the West and South regions (p=0.011). The impact of COVID-19 on off-service rotations for the emergency medicine residencies was not significant; Northeast had a high impact in 34% of the programs, moderate impact for Midwest (35%) and minimal impact in the South (34%) and West (29%) programs. Weekly lectures were switched to virtual format and smaller groups. Of note, clinical research for prospective studies was negatively impacted throughout all the regions (p=0.034), however retrospective studies were not affected. Additionally, 88% of programs reported changes since the start of COVID-19 to assure residents with new initiatives and activities such as improving wellness and reducing burnout and stress.