Traumatic pericardial tamponade

EDITOR.—We agree with Crawford et al. that it is difficult to make an early diagnosis of cardiac tamponade and even more difficult to diagnose penetrating cardiac injury in the haemodynamically stable patient without tamponade. Once tamponade has developed immediate intervention is critical. The role of rapid ultrasound and cross sectional echocardiography needs further clarification in these situations.

In several American trauma centres ultrasound examinations looking for haemopericardium and the more informative cross sectional echocardiography have been found to be very useful for the early diagnosis of penetrating cardiac injuries in haemodynamically stable patients. Provided that these examinations are readily available in the resuscitation room and performed and interpreted by trained technicians, cardiologists, trauma surgeons, or emergency physicians. In a study by Rozycki et al. of 247 patients who had ultrasound carried out by trauma surgeons, the sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy were 100%, 99%, and 99% respectively.1 Freshman and his colleagues did not show false negatives in a cross sectional echocardiographic examination of 32 patients in whom no pericardial effusion was found, contrary to the statement by Crawford et al.2 However, a recent prospective study of 105 patients by Meyer et al. showed that false negatives were a problem only in patients with a haemothorax, as cross sectional echocardiography missed four significant injuries. Otherwise the sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy of this investigation in those without haemothorax is at least as high as that of subxiphoid pericardiocentesis (100%, 89%, and 90% respectively).

The paper highlights the difficulties we face in the management of patients with traumatic haemopericardium in hospitals without cardiothoracic services on site. The matter is further complicated where there is no reliable 24 hour ultrasound service. In Glasgow, two haemodynamically stable patients decompensated rapidly, one requiring an emergency thoracotomy in the ward and the other in the resuscitation room. Both survived, but the outcome may have been different in other units. We suggest that another lesson to be learned from their experiences is to consider the option of rapid ultrasound or cross sectional echocardiography as early as possible when cardiac injury is suspected.


SHOs’ interpretation of x rays

EDITOR.—The article by McLauchlan et al. on x ray interpretation by A&E SHOs is both unscientific and unfair on our junior colleagues.

Essentially the authors have constructed an x ray quiz containing abnormalities that are both rare and often missed. So difficult were these films that none were identified by senior surgeons. The films were then shown, without any clinical information, to SHOs, many of whom had worked in A&E for just three weeks. This scenario is so far from reality as to render the results meaningless.

We all agree that a consultant based A&E service would improve standards but until that unlikely event occurs our junior staff deserve our support and not negative articles such as this. Of further concern is that this paper is likely to be quoted by those hostile to our specialty.

A fairer assessment of this issue is provided by an ongoing “missed fracture” audit in my department, which has shown that A&E SHOs miss one significant fracture for every 650 new attendances. A few of our more capable SHOs miss no significant abnormalities during their six months, and this variability in accuracy is worthy of further study.

CHRIS A J MCLAUCHLAN
Royal Devon and Exeter Hospital, Exeter

Curriculum based teaching

EDITOR.—We were interested by the article by Davies et al. on their experience of curriculum based teaching. We too have used such a curriculum based programme. It is organised by a committee of four (two consultants and two trainees) and all of its members have accredited teaching skills, for example advanced life support instructor, City and Guilds teacher’s certificate 7307. Consultants also contribute to the programme on the grounds that if you wish to benefit from the meetings you should be prepared to contribute to them. Two topics are covered in each afternoon meeting, with time built in for discussion. Although we do not attempt to rank our meetings we ask participants to evaluate them and this is circulated at the end of each meeting.

The speakers are either consultants who present a topic related to their area of expertise and interest, or trainees who are required to extend their knowledge base by addressing an allocated topic from the FFAEM curriculum, but avoiding areas where they are likely to have a large knowledge base. The trainees are given six months’ notice, allowing comprehensive research on their topic.

As regards content, all presentations have to be referenced from the most up to date sources and to be of the standard of Rosen et al. and the Oxford Textbook of Medicine. It is also a requirement that the presentation should make clear any audit or resource implications.

Throughout the course there is standardisation of format: all presentations to be on Microsoft Powerpoint and be accompanied by a document on Microsoft Word or Wordperfect. Presentations are given a title, chosen font type, point size, and the use of colours.

At the end of the each meeting, which is informal and allows for constructive debate, the speaker receives a summary of peer group evaluation (trainees only). The Word and Powerpoint files are copied from the presenter’s