

Brulés et réanimation digestive

ID: 20

Witnessing experts producing surgical antibiotic prophylaxis guidelines in digestive and visceral surgery: an ethnographic study

A. Deslandes*(1), M.Garnier(2), P.Baillet(3), D.Verjat-trannoy(4), J.Hajjar(5), P.Marre(5), H.Johanet(5), N.Christou(3), G.Birgand(1), M.Leone(6)

(1) CPias des Pays de la Loire, CHU de Nantes, Nantes, France , (2) Société Française d'Anesthésie Réanimation (SFAR), APHP, Paris, France , (3) Association Française de Chirurgie, AFC, Paris, France , (4) CPias Ile-de-France, Mission SPICMI, Paris, France , (5) Académie Nationale de Chirurgie, Académie Nationale de Chirurgie, Paris, France , (6) Société Française d'Anesthésie Réanimation (SFAR), AP-HM, Marseille, France

**Auteur présenté comme orateur*

Position du problème et objectif(s) de l'étude:

Surgical antibiotic prophylaxis (SAP) is critical in preventing Surgical Site Infection (SSI) in digestive surgery due to the high risk of SSI associated with this surgery. However, the implementation of preventive measures may be improved in routine practice. We observed a meeting of experts producing the next SAP guidelines to assess the group dynamics around guidelines production and understand how to improve them.

Matériel et méthodes:

The meeting took place on September 20th 2022 in Paris. The group included 23 members, mainly anesthetists and surgeons, along with a pediatrician, an interventional radiologist, and an infectious diseases specialist. Six participants were present on site, including two facilitators, and four others attended the meeting using videoconferencing (one facilitator), representing a 43% attendance rate. Among the ten participants, eight were anesthetists, one was an interventional radiologist and one was an infectious diseases specialist. None of the eight surgeons invited attended the meeting. We performed an ethnographic analysis of the group exchanges, using a sociogram to map interactions between participants and reflect team dynamics and patterns throughout the discussion.

Résultats & Discussion:

The meeting was led by three facilitators presenting the method and objectives to the group. Facilitators were mainly addressing the most experienced experts. Besides facilitators, three experts regularly participated in the exchanges. They were all professors with experience in guidelines production. The most experienced experts faced the facilitators, while the youngest were sitting on the same corner. There was no discussion on existing literature or guidelines that might arise from it. Discussion focused on organizational factors.

The group was not entirely involved in guidelines production. Only a few experts, mainly professors, actually provided substantial work in guidelines production. Despite the presence of various specialties in the group, few experts outside the specialty responsible for the guideline actually participated.

Conclusion:

Our observations suggest that improvements are possible in guidelines production: adapting recruitment modalities to involve motivated experts outside the main specialty, reducing group size and offering more autonomy to the group could lead to better teamwork and an improvement in guidelines production experience and quality.

