Exsanguinating pelvic fractures

Editor,—The resuscitation protocol for patients with multiple trauma (fig 1, algorithm) in the article by Meek and Ross on managing exsanguinating pelvic fractures in the UK is contrary to the discussion on imaging the stable patient. We are told that clinical examination is less troublesome in abdomen than the algorithm would be with his colleagues.

Otherwise, the paper was an excellent review of management priorities in this potentially troublesome group of unstable trauma patients.

Anthony F Brown
Staff Specialist, Department of Emergency Medicine, Royal Brisbane Hospital, Brisbane, Queensland 4029, Australia

The authors reply
We thank Dr Brown for highlighting an apparent contradiction in our review and we agree with his comments about computed tomography in stable patients, although our review was concerned with the exsanguinating patient. In addition to close observation, emergency computed tomography of the pelvis, abdomen, and men, and other areas as indicated in these stable patients is indeed invaluable. The box labelled “Watch very closely” should read “Watch very closely, computed tomography of the pelvis and abdomen”.


Cost of alternative models of care for primary care patients attending accident and emergency departments

Editor,—Among the tentative conclusions that Leydon et al make in their review paper is the suggestion that primary care physicians working in accident and emergency (A&E) departments conduct fewer investigations and make fewer referrals than A&E doctors. In coming to this conclusion they refer to four papers: three from Ireland, one from the Republic of Ireland. It would be valuable to examine the findings of two of these papers more closely before accepting the conclusion of Leydon et al uncritically.

Dale et al attempted to randomly allocate primary care patients to a given doctor (general practitioner (GP) or A&E training grade) during certain sessions in the A&E department. They point out that this system broke down: the primary care workload was excessive at which time additional doctors assisted in the treatment of these patients. In addition registrars assigned to treat primary care type patients were often prevented from completing these sessions by departmental circumstances. The registrars in this study identified a higher percentage of fractures in the primary care patients (9.3%) than the GPs (6.6%). This last piece of information gives rise to a number of possibilities, among them that the triage process was not rigorously applied, which in turn implies that the registrars and GPs dealt with different patient populations.

Murphy et al in their randomised controlled trial carried out in St James’s Hospital, Dublin make the valuable point that the lower rate of investigation and referral by GPs may reflect the fact that these patients were not admitted to the emergency department. On admission to the emergency department, Murphy and his coauthors avoided triage bias by looking at all category 3 (semiturgent) and category 4 (delay acceptable) patients. They did not attempt to separate “primary care” from “A&E” patients. This prudent measure avoids the apparent error of Dale’s paper and reflects the reality that there are specialist GPs who could be looked at after appropriately in an A&E or primary care setting, depending on the aptitude of individual GPs.

It is likely that GPs working in A&E and general practice look after non-urgent attenders who cost more efficiently than less experienced A&E doctors. However, it is also a fact of life in most of the country’s A&E departments (even those which provide a primary care service (staffed by GPs)) that A&E doctors will continue to look after some primary care problems. This being the case it would be useful to increase the emphasis on primary care in senior house officers and specialist registrar education programmes. It also highlights the desirability of a primary care secondment in the specialist registrar training programme. These measures could lead to a reduction of unnecessary investigation and admission by junior A&E doctors.

C V Egleston
Consultant, Emergency Department, Level C, Southmead General Hospital, Tramore Road, Southmead, BS10 5SD

The authors and Professor George Freeman reply
Mr Egleston (rightly) points out the “tentative” nature of our conclusions in our review paper. This was a function of the limited information on the actual costs associated with some of the primary care interventions reviewed. Notwithstanding this hurdle we proceeded to systematically examine the available evidence for the desirability of different models of dealing with the primary care attendant at the A&E department.

Egleston’s suggestion that there may have been a difference in the case mix dealt with by GPs and hospital doctors in the Dale study is valid. Indeed Dale and his colleagues highlighted this as a potential bias in their paper.

The randomisation to registrars was the most problematic in the King’s study as they were most likely to be called away. They also by chance seemed to have a higher rate of fractures in the case load in the A&E department, which was not thought to be significant. The possible biases were fully explored in the Dale analysis, such as the possibility that the pressures in the emergency department may have influenced the A&E system in operation, and these were not thought to be significant.

Further, the size of the study, the significant difference in per case costs between GP and hospital doctor, and the similar levels of patient satisfaction expressed during follow up strongly supports the argument that GPs can treat certain types of patient more cost effectively in the A&E department, without deleterious effects on patient outcome and satisfaction. This conclusion is corroborated by other studies, in particular the study conducted by Murphy and his colleagues in Dublin.

The effect that experience has on a doctor’s (whether GP, senior house officer, or registrar) method of practice is, of course, an important issue that requires conclusion. Otherwise, we believe that the paper was more concentrated in the number of patients dealt with by Murphy’s paper was 32 for GPs and 26 for the usual A&E medical staff. Differences in investigations, referrals, and so on may not just interact with years of experience but also with the type of experience, training, and “culture” worked in. Why GPs treating certain types of patients appears to be cheaper, despite higher staff costs per hour, is unclear. Is it experience and the confidence that follows? Is it training? Further, what effect does patient expectation play on the trajectory of the consultation and the decisions made? Do patients expect more “active” investigative work from a “hospital” doctor than from a GP working in A&E? These questions might be fruitfully explored further.

Finally, we would support the idea that senior house officer and specialist registrar training programmes should increase the emphasis on primary care and should include a secondment in general practice. This could lead to a better understanding of the attendance, available for effectively managing this significant proportion of their patient population.


Primary care problems in patients attending a semi-rural accident and emergency unit

Editor,—We were interested to read the article by Cottingham,1 however his article appears to be based on false premises and contains a number of serious inaccuracies. The aim of his study is described as being to

Exsanguinating pelvic fractures.

A F Brown
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