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Executive summary

Children are different – they are not just small adults.

What defines a child? What is severe trauma in relation to a child? How should a child with severe trauma be imaged? These are simple questions but the answers are complex. Childhood covers the period from birth through adolescence to adulthood and thus there can be no one size fits all answer to how a particular child with a particular injury should be imaged. For example, injuries regarded as common and serious in the adult population such as spinal or pelvic injury are exceedingly rare in pre-adolescent children. Injuries regarded as life-threatening in the adult population (for example, liver and spleen trauma) are routinely managed conservatively in children. In addition, it has recently become increasingly clear that the cancer risk of computed tomography (CT) in childhood is real, significant and is higher in younger ages.

The following guidelines will assist radiologists and clinicians dealing with a severely injured child to base imaging decisions on the best available evidence. The emphasis is on careful, competent clinical evaluation and knowledge of injury patterns in children of various ages, judicious use of plain radiographs and targeted use of CT with relevant paediatric protocols. The use of adult protocols and in particular the ‘whole-body’ CT trauma survey is not appropriate as a routine investigation in childhood.

Dr John Somers
Dr Nicholas Ashford
Dr Judith Foster
Introduction

This document should be read in conjunction with the RCR’s Standards of practice and guidance for trauma radiology in severely injured patients.¹ Where there is a perceived discrepancy this paediatric document should take precedence for patients under 16 years of age.

The intended purpose of the paediatric guidelines is to recognise the different physiological and anatomical considerations of the growing child and to highlight the different approach to imaging needed. The decision-making in imaging injured paediatric patients should always be underpinned by clinical discussions at a senior level between radiologists, emergency physicians and other relevant subspecialties.

This document will discuss the relevant indications and appropriate imaging for each anatomical region. Variations dependent on age will be highlighted.
Standard of care

All children, regardless of age, who are admitted to a paediatric major trauma centre or paediatric trauma unit, should expect to receive a high standard of appropriate and timely care. The wellbeing and safety of the patient are paramount and this is never more so than when dealing with an injured child. This relates both to clinical management and any radiological imaging. All imaging should be appropriate to the child’s age and clinical condition and be reported by a suitably trained radiologist. Exposure to ionising radiation should always be kept to a minimum and the ‘as low as reasonably achievable’ (ALARA) principles should be adhered to. The ‘routine’ use of adult trauma protocols is inappropriate. General considerations for prioritising patient safety are included in Appendix 1.
Incidence and pattern of paediatric trauma

The incidence of paediatric major trauma within the UK is low when compared with adults. A retrospective analysis of paediatric data from the Trauma Audit & Research Network for the year beginning 1 April 2012, corresponding to the introduction of the National Trauma Networks in England, clearly illustrates this point.2

The total number of individuals aged 16 years and above admitted to hospitals in the UK and submitted to TARN was 36,369 and there were 2,409 children under 16 years (Table 1).2 While the national paediatric trauma workload is relatively low, the majority of children in this 12-month period were initially conveyed to predominantly adult-orientated centres (Table 2, Figure 1).2 For these children, initially seen at an adult major trauma centre (MTC), a combined adult and paediatric MTC or a trauma unit (TU), it is important that appropriate paediatric management pathways are in place.

### Table 1. The total number of individuals aged 16 years and above admitted to hospitals in the UK2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age band</th>
<th>Isolated head Pts</th>
<th>Isolated face Pts</th>
<th>Isolated chest Pts</th>
<th>Isolated abdo Pts</th>
<th>Isolated extremity Pts</th>
<th>Isolated external Pts</th>
<th>Multiple injuries Pts</th>
<th>None Pts</th>
<th>Total Pts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–5</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–11</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–15</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 &amp; over</td>
<td>8700</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4652</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10142</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>9299</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4753</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1424</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11247</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sites: all UK hospitals; Date range: 01/04/2012–31/03/2013. Admission type: All – direct and unmatched transfers in; Age limit: None; Grouping: Body area of AIS 3+ severity injuries

### Table 2. Number of children seen in an MTC vs other type of hospital2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age band</th>
<th>ISS&lt;9 Paeds MTC</th>
<th>ISS = 9–15 Paeds MTC</th>
<th>ISS&gt;15 Paeds MTC</th>
<th>ISS&lt;9 Other hospitals</th>
<th>ISS = 9–15 Other hospitals</th>
<th>ISS&gt;15 Other hospitals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>1557</td>
<td>1005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total aged 0–16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% aged 0–16 1% 6% 4% 11% 55% 23%

Sites: all UK hospitals; Date range: 01/04/2012–31/03/2013. Admission type: Direct; Age limit: <20 years; Grouping: Hospital type, ISS band
A review of the present CT imaging practice between mixed and stand-alone paediatric centres does suggest some variation in practice. Those children who required a CT were more likely to have multiple areas scanned if they were imaged in a mixed MTC rather than a stand-alone paediatric MTC. For those children undergoing CT scan in a paediatric MTC in England, only 3% had a full body CT compared with 9% in an adult unit Table 3, Figure 2. This practice variation reflects previous reports from the USA.3,4

Table 3. Number of all directly admitted patients with CT within four hours of emergency department arrival that had a full body scan in this timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age band</th>
<th>Patients with full-body CT within 4 hours</th>
<th>All patients with CT within 4 hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Patients with full-body CT within 4 hours</th>
<th>All patients with CT within 4 hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Patients with full-body CT within 4 hours</th>
<th>All patients with CT within 4 hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sites: all UK hospitals; Date range: 01/04/2012–31/03/2013. Admission type: Direct with CT within 4 hours of ED arrival; Age limit: <20 years; Grouping: Hospital type, CT type within 4 hours; Description: The number of patients with CT within 4 hours of emergency department arrival that had a full body scan in this timeframe.
The hospital data submitted to TARN shows that in the majority of paediatric cases injuries were mainly of the extremities, and to a lesser extent the head and cervical spine. The injury pattern in children is typically to an isolated anatomical area rather than multiple sites (Table 1, Figure 3). It is important to appreciate this pattern of potential injury when considering the need for imaging.

* Extremity groups all four limbs as one body area; ie, a patient can have injuries to more than one limb
Ionising radiation considerations

A number of recent publications have highlighted the fact that there is no safe lower level of radiation exposure. The increased risk from ionising radiation in children is due to a number of factors. Developing and maturing tissues in the growing child are more radiosensitive, there is a cumulative radiation risk over a lifetime, and they have a longer lifetime in which to express the increased relative risk. These factors emphasise the need to adhere to the ALARA principle. Within the United States, there is an increasingly influential Image gently campaign, which advocates reducing ionising radiation in children.

Using the ALARA principle in a trauma setting, the initial clinical question needs to be: ‘Does this child need imaging at all?’ If imaging is required, further questions should be asked in regards to which anatomical areas need to be covered, and whether primary imaging should be plain radiographs or an alternative modality such as CT.
Choice of imaging modality

In the acute paediatric trauma setting there is currently no role for ultrasound outside of assisting in interventional procedures. The RCR Guidelines for the severely injured patient (2010) state that ‘Focused Abdominal Sonography in Trauma (FAST) does not offer any additional information to that obtained with a CT scan’ and should not be performed if it would delay transfer to CT with studies demonstrating negative predictive values of only 50–63% in unstable patients. This document focuses on adult patients but abdominal ultrasound has also been shown to have only modest sensitivity in detecting haemoperitoneum in children.

In the acutely injured child, magnetic resonance (MR) imaging is primarily reserved for potential spinal cord injury, though it is acknowledged that access to MR imaging may be difficult.

The most appropriate imaging modality will be covered in more detail within this document by anatomical area. The value of a normal radiograph for specific areas must not be underestimated. Discussion between a senior radiologist and emergency physician about the radiographic findings may be all that is necessary to exclude significant injury and obviate the need for further imaging. All imaging pathways for suspected injury must rely on robust clinical observation as their starting point.

If CT is deemed the most appropriate investigation, appropriate dose reduction procedures must be in place. All CT manufacturers have dose reduction software and these should be used to their full extent. If possible the use of more advanced iterative reconstruction software applications should be made available. These reconstructive algorithms may add considerable delay in producing the definitive image and this should be taken into account, and balanced with the clinical situation. Significant dose reduction can be achieved in paediatric patients without any loss of diagnostic information by the use of judicious kilovolt and milliampere reduction.

Cranial imaging

CT is the primary investigation for cranial imaging in the child who has suffered head trauma. It displays high sensitivity and specificity for identification of traumatic brain injury and is readily available in most centres. However the dose of ionising radiation required for cranial CT has been demonstrated to be associated with an increased incidence of cancer and it should not be used for all children with head injury. The indications for cranial imaging have therefore been evaluated by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) and are summarised in the algorithm presented as Figure 4.

All children with head injuries should be assessed by an appropriately trained professional within 15 minutes of hospital presentation, and immediately if there is any reduction in conscious level. Adequate resuscitation, clinical examination and administration of analgesia should take place in the process of deciding whether to perform CT.

Isolated head injuries are common in childhood and fulfilling the criteria for a cranial CT scan is not an indication on its own for a CT of the cervical spine or any other body part.

Cranial CT should be performed before administration of intravenous contrast. Following the ALARA principle, avoidance of the lens should be optimised.
Cervical spine imaging

Paediatric cervical spine injury is uncommon.\textsuperscript{16,17} Appropriate clinical evaluation must be undertaken before imaging is performed as it is an anatomical area that is relatively radiosensitive. Prior to cervical spine imaging a full history and examination must be performed where possible, with any imaging being complementary to other features elicited. Imaging should not be used in isolation as a diagnostic measure.

The criteria employed in the 2014 NICE guideline (CG176) for determining whether cervical spine imaging is required is extrapolated from a clinical decision rule that was originally derived for adults; the Canadian C-spine rule.\textsuperscript{18} Figure 5 shows the process for the selection of children for imaging of the cervical spine.\textsuperscript{15} It should be noted that the algorithm presented is extracted from NICE guideline CG176 which refers primarily to management of head injury – presence of head injury alone is not sufficient to enter the starting point of the algorithm; rather there must be clinical suspicion (based on history or examination) of potential cervical spine injury.

Initial imaging of the cervical spine may be with plain radiographs or CT scan depending on the clinical situation. Where plain radiographs are...
indicated, an adequate cervical spine series must include (i) lateral cervical spine X-ray to include the base of skull and the junction of C7 and T1, (ii) Anteroposterior cervical spine x-ray to include C2 to T1 and (iii) an adequate peg view if attainable. Peg views may be difficult in young children. However it is recommended that if they can obey commands and open their mouth a peg view should be attempted. Adequate radiographs of the cervical spine may exclude significant bony injury and obviate the need for CT.

In a stable child undergoing cranial CT, discussion between senior radiologists and senior clinicians as to the most appropriate imaging of the neck (where clinically indicated) is advised. It is inappropriate to perform cervical spine imaging automatically when performing cranial imaging without appropriate discussion.

Figure 5. Selection of children for imaging of the cervical spine

Imaging the spine
Potential spinal injuries should be assessed on a case-by-case basis with appropriate imaging guided by discussion with the radiologist where clinical condition allows.

General principles

- Clinical assessment should underpin investigations
- Plain radiographs of the injured region will generally be the primary investigation.
Targeted CT of an area may be required for further assessment.

CT of the lumbar spine is included in CT of the abdomen and pelvis.

Where there are definitive neurological signs, the primary imaging modality should be MR where possible.

Imaging the chest

- The primary investigation for blunt chest trauma is the chest X-ray. This will detect pneumothorax, haemothorax, rib fractures, gross mediastinal abnormalities, diaphragmatic injuries and rib fracture.\textsuperscript{19–22}
- Penetrating trauma is an indication for contrast-enhanced chest CT due to the incidence of occult vascular injury.
- Further imaging in blunt chest trauma should be dictated by the nature of the trauma, the clinical condition of the child and the initial radiographic findings.
- In the following patients CT can be obviated as it is unlikely to lead to a change in management:\textsuperscript{23}
  - The chest film is normal
  - The patient is conscious
  - The patient is clinically stable.

Thoracic spine

If there is a high index of suspicion of thoracic spine injury, plain films and MRI are recommended.\textsuperscript{24} If MRI is not acutely available, localised CT of the affected area should be performed.

Imaging the abdomen

- Where clinically indicated contrast-enhanced CT is the modality of choice for the assessment of acute traumatic intra-abdominal injury.\textsuperscript{25–28}
- Single-volume dual-contrast CT of the abdomen is advised to minimise radiation burden.
- An example of a suitable contrast and timings calculator is included (see the Camp Bastion contrast wheel, Appendix 2).
- A hand injection of contrast is appropriate in very small children and babies.

- There are no mechanisms of injury which mandate abdominal CT as an isolated factor. Decisions to perform abdominal CT should be made on the basis of the clinical history and examination.\textsuperscript{29}
- Where there is an isolated head injury, a reduced Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) score should not be the only justification for abdominal CT. The decision to perform abdominal CT should be made on the basis of the clinical history and examination.
- Special consideration may need to be given to those children who are intubated prior to hospital assessment or who require transfer to another centre.
- The following clinical variables have been found to be associated with intra-abdominal injury and may indicate the need for abdominal CT:\textsuperscript{30,31}
  - Lap belt or handle bar injuries
  - Abdominal wall ecchymosis
  - Abdominal tenderness in a conscious patient
  - Abdominal distension
  - Clinical evidence of persistent hypovolaemia; for example, persistent unexplained tachycardia
  - Blood from the rectum or nasogastric tube.

- Abdominal injuries are rare where there is neurological impairment in the absence of abdominal signs and symptoms.\textsuperscript{32}
- The effect of CT information has been documented to have an effect on management plans and monitoring of patients.\textsuperscript{33}
- A normal CT strongly predicts the lack of subsequent deterioration of a patient’s condition.\textsuperscript{33}

Imaging limbs

- Using the clinical history and examination, clinicians should request plain radiographs of the injured region as the primary investigation.
- This will usually be anteroposterior and lateral views including the adjacent joints.
- CT may be required for complex fractures.
Imaging the pelvis

- Pelvic fractures are rare in children.
- A screening pelvic radiograph is not indicated in all cases.34–36
- Pelvic imaging should only be considered if there are concerns after clinical assessment.
- The presence of a pelvic brace is not an indication in isolation for imaging without prior clinical assessment.
- Pelvic fractures can be associated with multi-organ injuries. The bony pelvis will be included on CT evaluation of the abdomen and pelvis. Where clinically indicated, contrast-enhanced CT of the abdomen and pelvis is the modality of choice.

CT dose optimisation

- Use scan parameters – mA, kVp and pitch according to a patient’s weight or age.37
- There should be an acceptable level of noise for ‘trauma scanning’.
- Single-phase acquisition with a dual contrast model – see Appendix 2. Camp Bastion contrast wheel.
- Use iterative reconstruction, tube current modulation or organ-based modulation where available.38
- Use protocols to reduce dose to particularly radiosensitive areas, for example, lens, where possible.
- Use of breast and thyroid shields should be considered.

Interventional radiology

Paediatric patients who require interventional radiology should be treated in a dedicated tertiary referral centre by an expert in interventional radiology with appropriate skills where possible.
Conclusion

This document provides clear evidence based guidance for those involved in imaging decisions for paediatric trauma. Injury patterns in children differ vastly to those in adults; this important factor must be taken into account. The need to keep radiation dose as low as possible while still providing good quality examinations is paramount. Evidence-based guidance has been given regarding appropriate imaging protocols and particular note should be made of:

- The template for acute primary assessment report for paediatric CT with major trauma (Appendix 3)
- The Camp Bastion contrast calculator (Appendix 2)
- The emergency department paediatric trauma imaging decision tool (Appendix 4).

This document is intended to ensure that the wellbeing and safety of the child is paramount.

Approved by the Clinical Radiology Faculty Board: 31 October 2013
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Appendix 1. General considerations and recommendations that will ensure patient safety is of the highest priority during imaging

All providers of clinical care should be working to improve the reliability of care so that patients and families can be confident that their safety will be paramount at all times. The safety of patients in complex situations challenges even the most organised departments.

The following check list is provided to support imaging departments and teams in their preparation for the management of children in the imaging department following injury. It is good practice to rehearse infrequent scenarios so that levels of confidence and competence in exceptional situations can be the highest possible. This can be part of a major trauma simulation or as part of a regular team review and verbal simulation with the imaging team only.

It is human nature to sometimes overlook important items when under the pressure of exceptional stress or limited time. Check lists and prompts reduce the risk of errors of omission (to forget) or commission (to do the wrong thing). Having trauma cards can enable high levels of reliability in even the most pressured of situations.

The following list is not exhaustive but is given to prompt the team to consider the patient and family experience as well as the importance of technique and imaging excellence:

1. Preparation for unexpected events
2. Environment
3. Communication with clinical teams
4. Communication with patient and family
5. Onward communication of results, events, and ensuring safe handover of care.
6. Reflection and feedback on learning.

Preparing for unexpected events. Sudden haemorrhage, deterioration in conscious level, cardiac arrest can all happen just before or during the imaging sequence. Regular review of the locations of emergency equipment and rehearsal of roles and responsibilities enables the fastest response. Ensuring that the team coming with the patient bring with them all necessary emergency equipment not available in the scanner suite is recommended. Thinking the unthinkable ensures preparedness.

Environmental factors are important considerations when children are critically ill. Ensuring appropriate precautions are taken to avoid the patient becoming cold is recommended. The value of age-specific comforters may or may not be appropriate depending on the severity of injury, but they can be considered. Reducing noise and commotion will help everyone focus on the patient.

Communications with the clinical team will be best undertaken using a structured communication tool such as situation, background, assessment and recommendation (SBAR). This may seem obvious, but in pressured situations ensuring communication is structured will avoid confusion or misunderstanding and ensure good team work (see Example 1).

Example 1.
Yes we can undertake the scan however:

(S) We have a patient on the scanner now and it will take five minutes to clear the room

(B) To bring the patient immediately into the scanner is, in our experience, safest
(A) We need ten minutes to clear and prepare, do you know the weight of the child so we can prepare the contrast?

(R) We recommend you arrive in ten minutes with all the necessary resuscitation equipment as we do not hold paediatric-sized equipment.

Communication with the patient and family should be sensitive and straightforward, avoiding complex terms that may confuse at the same time as being open. Ensuring the family know the order of events can turn a highly stressful situation into a less stressful one. Any questions about radiation dose should be answered, indicating the attention paid to dose minimisation and benefits and when and how the images will be reviewed. Due regard to radiation safety according to local protocols is necessary but so is the sensitive explanation of how the team are paying the very best attention to balancing risk and benefit. Sometimes rehearsal of a genuine script can help staff improve their management of this situation.

Onward communication of results should be clearly defined as part of the transfer of the patient from the imaging suite back to clinical area. This may not be easy to define exactly (reporting times may vary) but an indication of when the results will be available and how should be considered so as to create a consistent expectation. The NPSA/College guidance on communication of important findings\textsuperscript{i,ii} clearly applies in such situations and the department team should consider what their standard process will be. Any unexpected events observed in the imaging department should be included in the imaging record and in handover and clinical notes to ensure they are part of the clinical record. In such situations ‘closed loop communications’ is recommended; for example, the report will be available in ten minutes on the PACS, please ring us if it is not available after 15 minutes so we can find out why.

Reflection, feedback and learning are signs of a mature team with safety and ‘mindfulness’ at the forefront of their routine. Every event has the potential to teach someone something and unexpected events are critical learning situations that should be maximised through onward communication and the team considering ‘how might we manage that better next time’. A lesson from military aviation is salient here, part of the debrief schedule is to ask, ‘Thinking about what happened and what we know now, what should we have prepared for before we set off.’

A framework with which to consider the measurement and monitoring of patient safety has five areas of attention as described below:\textsuperscript{iii}

\begin{center}
\textbf{Past harm} \hspace{2cm} \textbf{Reliability} \\
\textbf{Integration and learning} \hspace{2cm} \textbf{Safety measurement and monitoring} \\
\textbf{Anticipation and preparedness} \hspace{2cm} \textbf{Sensitivity to operations}
\end{center}

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
Appendix 2. Camp bastion contrast calculator

Scan protocol: 2/3 contrast volume injected at slow rate x, and 1/3 volume injected at approximately 2x. Contrast rates are calculated for injection phase to last 70 secs. Scan initiated at 70 seconds.
Appendix 3. Acute primary assessment report for paediatric CT with major trauma

| Patient name |  
| Patient number |  
| Date of scan |  

To guide initial management only. A formal report will follow. The trauma team will be notified of any major alterations to this primary assessment.

**Primary assessment trauma plain films** *(for stable children)*

| Cervical spine |  
| Abnormal/clinical suspicion | CT C-spine required |  
| Normal | No CT C-spine indicated |  

| Chest X-ray |  
| Abnormal/clinical suspicion | CT TAP required |  
| Normal | No CT chest indicated | Proceed to CT abdo/pelvis if needed |  

**CT scanning preliminary review**

**Airway:**

| ET placement | N/A | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory |  
| Airway obstruction | Yes | No |  

**Breathing:**

| Contusion | Yes | No |  
| Laceration | Yes | No |  
| Pneumothorax | Yes | No |  
| Chest drain placement | N/A | Satisfactory | Unsatisfactory |  

**Circulation (bleeding):**

| Pericardial effusion | Yes | No |  
| Thoracic injury | Yes | No |  
| Abdominal injury | retroperitoneal | Yes | No |  
| visceral | Yes | No |  
| Pelvic injury | Yes | No |  
| Soft tissue | Yes | No |  

**Disability:**

| Intracranial bleed/oedema | Yes | No |  
| Major spinal injury (cord compromise) | Yes | No |  

**Comments:**

| Name of radiologist |  
| Time |  

Appendix 4. Emergency department paediatric major trauma imaging decision tool

Developed by Dr Tony Kehoe, ED Consultant, Derriford Emergency Department