Best evidence topic reports (BETs) summarise the evidence pertaining to particular clinical questions. They are not systematic reviews, but rather contain the best (highest level) evidence that can be practically obtained by busy practising clinicians. The search strategies used to find the best evidence are reported in detail in order to allow clinicians to update searches whenever necessary. The BETs published below were first reported at the Critical Appraisal Journal Club at the Manchester Royal Infirmary. Each BET has been constructed in the four stages that have been described elsewhere. The BETs shown here together with those published previously and those currently under construction can be seen at http://www.bestbets.org. Four positive and three negative BETs are included in this issue of the journal.
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Detection of pneumoperitoneum on erect chest radiograph

Report by John Butler, Specialist Registrar

Abstract

A short cut review was carried out to establish whether a normal erect chest radiograph excludes the diagnosis of perforated abdominal viscus. Altogether 37 papers were found using the reported search, of which two presented the best evidence to answer the clinical question. The author, date and country of publication, patient group studied, study type, relevant outcomes, results and study weaknesses of these best papers are shown in table 1. A clinical bottom line is stated.

Clinical scenario

A 37 year old female patient attends the emergency department with a four hour history of epigastric pain. The patient has been taking non-steroidal anti-inflammatory tablets for backache for the past few months. On examination she has mild tenderness in the epigastric region but no peritonism. You wonder whether an erect chest radiograph is sensitive enough to exclude a perforation of an abdominal viscus.

Three part question

In [patients with a possible perforated abdominal viscus] does [a normal erect chest radiograph] exclude [pneumoperitoneum]?

Search strategy

Medline 1966–11/01 using the OVID interface. ((exp pneumoperitoneum OR exp intestinal perforation OR exp abdominal pain OR exp abdomen acute) AND (exp radiography, thoracic)) LIMIT to human AND English.

Search outcome

Altogether 37 papers found of which two papers were relevant to the original question.

Comment(s)

The available evidence on the sensitivity of upright abdominal chest radiographs at detecting pneumoperitoneum is poor. No studies looked at patients attending the emergency department with abdominal pain. However, the available evidence suggests that an erect posteroanterior chest radiograph is not sufficiently sensitive to be used as a sNout for pneumoperitoneum in such patients. Sensitivity might be improved by performing either an erect lateral chest radiograph or computed tomography.

CLINICAL BOTTOM LINE

An erect posteroanterior chest radiograph is not sufficiently sensitive to rule out pneumoperitoneum in patients attending emergency departments with abdominal pain.


Cervical spine radiography in alert asymptomatic blunt trauma patients

Report by Damian Bates, Specialist Registrar
Checked by John Butler, Specialist Registrar

Abstract

A short cut review was carried out to establish whether a normal cervical spine radiograph excludes bony cervical spine injury in alert, asymptomatic trauma patients. Altogether 232 papers were found using the reported search, of which six presented the best evidence to answer the clinical question. The author, date and country of publication, patient group studied, study type, relevant outcomes, results and study weaknesses of these best papers are shown in table 2. A clinical bottom line is stated.

Clinical scenario

A 46 year old man is brought to the emergency department after a road traffic accident, involving a rear end shunt, to “get checked out”. He is fully alert and cooperative. You are aware that many people advise radiographs in all patients to exclude cervical spine injury. You wonder whether this is really necessary.

Three part question

In [alert asymptomatic blunt trauma patients] is [cervical spine radiography] necessary to [exclude bony injury to the cervical spine]?

Search strategy

Medline 1966–10/01 using the OVID interface. [exp cervical vertebrae OR exp spinal cord injuries OR exp spinal fractures OR exp spinal injuries OR cervical spine injury.mp] AND [exp x-rays OR x-rays.mp OR exp radiography OR radiograph$.mp OR cervical radiograph$.mp] AND [exp prospective studies OR prospective studies.mp]. LIMIT to human and English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, date and country</th>
<th>Patient group</th>
<th>Study type (level of evidence)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Key results</th>
<th>Study weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stappakis JC et al, 1992, USA</td>
<td>13 patients with known pneumoperitoneum after diagnostic peritoneal lavage</td>
<td>Diagnostic study of upright PA chest radiograph and CT of abdomen</td>
<td>Sensitivity of chest radiograph and CT for detection of pneumoperitoneum</td>
<td>CT demonstrated free gas in all cases</td>
<td>Iatrogenic pneumoperitoneum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodring JH et al, 1995, USA</td>
<td>100 consecutive patients with pneumoperitoneum from a variety of causes</td>
<td>Diagnostic study</td>
<td>Sensitivity of upright PA chest radiograph</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>Pneumoperitoneum form a variety of causes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sensitivity of lateral upright chest radiograph</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>Only 7 patients presenting as emergencies with acute perforated abdominal viscus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difference between upright and lateral radiographs</td>
<td>18% p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>Gold standard for pneumoperitoneum variable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, date and country</th>
<th>Patient group</th>
<th>Study type (level of evidence)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Key results</th>
<th>Study weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roberge RJ et al, 1988, USA</td>
<td>467 blunt trauma patients undergoing c-spine radiograph</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>Cervical spine injury</td>
<td>In alert patients cervical spine pain</td>
<td>Sensitivity 100% (54–100). Cervical spine tenderness, sensitivity 100% (54–100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberge RJ and Wears RC, 1992, USA</td>
<td>480 blunt trauma patients undergoing c-spine radiograph</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>Cervical spine injury</td>
<td>Clinical examination in alert patients, sensitivity 93% (75–100). Negative predictive value 98.7% (94.9–100)</td>
<td>Not all patients included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman JR et al, 1992, USA</td>
<td>974 blunt trauma patients who had radiograph performed and data sheet filled in</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>Cervical spine fracture</td>
<td>Alert patient with no intoxication, midline neck tenderness or distracting injury, sensitivity=100%</td>
<td>No search for misses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velhamos GC et al, 1996, USA</td>
<td>549 blunt trauma patients Alert, not intoxicated and no neck pain Brought to hospital in hard collar</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>Cervical spine injury or fracture</td>
<td>All patients had normal c-spine examination, No c-spine fractures or cord injuries found</td>
<td>No search for misses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzalez RP et al, 1999, USA</td>
<td>2176 consecutive blunt trauma patients GCs 14 or 15</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>Cervical spine injury</td>
<td>Clinical examination 91% sensitivity for CSI, lateral c-spine screen [x,游泳者CT] 61% sensitivity for CSI</td>
<td>Includes intoxicated patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman JR et al, 2000, USA</td>
<td>34069 patients having cervical spine radiographs after blunt trauma 21 centres</td>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>Clinically significant cervical spine injury</td>
<td>Decision instrument [alert with no evidence of intoxication, no midline cervical tenderness and no neurological deficit or distracting injury]. Sensitivity of 99.6% (98.6–100) for significant injury, negative predictive value 99.9% (98.8–100)</td>
<td>No power calculation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
The use of antibiotics in venomous snake bite

Report by Polly Terry, Specialist Registrar
Checked by Kevin Mackway-Jones, Professor

Abstract

A short cut review was carried out to establish whether antibiotics reduce the incidence of infection after venomous snake bite. Altogether 60 papers were found using the reported search, of which three presented the best evidence to answer the clinical question. The author, date and country of publication, patient group studied, study type, relevant outcomes, results and study weaknesses of these papers are shown in table 3. A clinical bottom line is stated.

Clinical scenario
A 26 year old man attends the emergency department having been bitten on his right hand 30 minutes previously by his pet a venomous snake. Examination reveals extensive swelling of his forearm with lymphangitis, hypotension and gingival bleeding. He has no relevant previous medical history and is fully immunised against tetanus. You know there is the potential for infection from the snakes fangs and oropharynx, as well as contamination from the victim’s skin and clothing. You thoroughly clean the wound with local wound toilet, and are happy that there is no fang left in situ. You wonder if prophylactic antibiotics are indicated to reduce the risk of infection.

Three part question
In [well adults who have been bitten by a venomous snake] do [prophylactic antibiotics] reduce [the incidence of infection]? (OVID interface. {((exp snake bite$ or snake bite$.mp) and (exp antibiotic$.mp) or (exp prophylaxis$.mp))} LIMIT to human AND English.

Search strategy
Medline 1966–10/01 using the OVID interface. {(exp snake bite$ OR snake bite$.mp) AND (exp antibiotics OR anti-biotics OR antibiotic$.mp)) LIMIT to human AND English.

Search outcome
Altogether 60 papers of which three were relevant to the original question.

Comment(s)
Most of the trials involved small numbers and were affected by the use of antivenin, which in itself has antibacterial activity. There is concern that use of antibiotics prophylactically will have little impact on further infection but may give rise to side effects, is not cost effective and may select out more resistant organisms. These studies again confirm the low event rate for infection after snake bite from venomous snakes.

Clinical bottom line
Prophylactic antibiotics are not required in snake bites from venomous snakes.
Activated charcoal and gastric absorption of iron compounds

Report by Steve Jones, Specialist Registrar
Checked by Baha Ali, Senior Clinical Fellow

Abstract

A short cut review was carried out to establish whether activated charcoal is effective in iron overdose. Altogether 17 papers were found using the reported search, of which only one was relevant. The author, date and country of publication, patient group studied, study type, relevant outcomes, results and study weaknesses of this paper are shown in table 4. A clinical bottom line is stated.

Clinical scenario

A young woman presents to the emergency department having taken an overdose of her iron tablets. She is in an emotionally distressed state but is cardiovascularly stable and requests treatment. It has been less than two hours since she took the tablets and you prescribe activated charcoal. You wonder whether this will actually do her any good.

Three part question

In [a patient with an iron overdose] is [activated charcoal better than nothing] at [reducing gastric absorption, mortality or morbidity]?

Search strategy

Medline 1966–10/01 using the OVID interface. {((exp poisoning OR poisoning.mp) OR exp overdose OR overdose.mp) AND (exp iron OR exp iron compounds OR iron.mp) AND (exp charcoal OR charcoal.mp OR activated charcoal.mp)) LIMIT to human AND English.}

Search outcome

Altogether 17 papers found of which only one was relevant to the original question.

Comment(s)

This study partially answers the question and concludes that more work needs to be done. In the doses given to these healthy patients, activated charcoal reduced absorption; this was reduced further by adding desferrioxamine to the oral solution. Toxic doses are considered to be fourfold higher than physiological doses- iron plus activated charcoal (AC) plus desferrioxamine 37 µg/dl 13

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, date and country</th>
<th>Patient group</th>
<th>Study type (level of evidence)</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Key results</th>
<th>Study weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gomez HF et al, 1997, USA</td>
<td>11 healthy adult volunteers</td>
<td>Controlled, prospective crossover study</td>
<td>Maximum serum iron concentration:</td>
<td>150 µg/dl 36&lt;br&gt;94 µg/dl 23&lt;br&gt;37 µg/dl 13&lt;br&gt;(p 0.0017)</td>
<td>Healthy volunteers&lt;br&gt;Strict exclusion criteria&lt;br&gt;Physiological doses of iron rather than toxic doses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- iron only&lt;br&gt;- iron plus activated charcoal (AC)&lt;br&gt;- iron plus AC plus desferrioxamine</td>
<td>3.5 h 0.3&lt;br&gt;3.6 h 0.5&lt;br&gt;3.0 h 1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phenytoin or paraldehyde as the second drug for convulsions in children

Report by Will Townend, Specialist Registrar
Checked by Kevin Mackway-Jones, Professor

Abstract
A short cut review was carried out to establish whether phenytoin or paraldehyde should be given as the second drug for resistant fits in children. Altogether 41 papers were found using the reported search, of which none answered the question posed. Further research is needed in this area.

Clinical scenario
A fitting three year old child presents to the emergency department. The child has received an appropriate dose of rectal diazepam from the prehospital team. After administration of a dose of intravenous lorazepam the child continues to fit. You wonder whether there is any evidence to suggest whether paraldehyde or phenytoin should be given next.

Three part question
In a [child continuing to fit after two doses of benzodiazepines] is [phenytoin or paraldehyde] more effective in [controlling seizure activity]?

Search strategy
Medline 1966–10/01 using the OVID interface. ({exp seizures OR seizure$.mp OR fit$.mp OR exp convulsions OR epilepsy.mp} AND {exp paraldehyde OR paraldehyde.mp} AND {phenytoin.mp OR fosphenytoin.mp OR exp phenytoin}) LIMIT to human AND English.

Search outcome
Altogether 41 papers found of which none were relevant to the original question.

Comment(s)
There is no research in this area.

▲ CLINICAL BOTTOM LINE
Consensus guidelines should be followed.

Aspiration of acute traumatic knee haemarthrosis

Report by Paul Wallman, Senior Clinical Fellow
Checked by Simon Carley, Specialist Registrar

Abstract
A short cut review was carried out to establish whether aspiration of a traumatic knee haemarthrosis improved the patient’s symptoms. Altogether 267 papers were found using the reported search, of which none answered the question posed. Further research is needed in this area.

Clinical scenario
A 40 year old man presents to the emergency department one day after suffering an injury to his knee. There is no evidence of bony injury on radiography and a diagnosis of a traumatic haemarthrosis is made. You are unsure whether aspiration of the tense haemarthrosis will benefit him symptomatically.

Three part question
In [patients with an acute traumatic haemarthrosis of the knee] does [aspiration] [improve symptoms]?

Search strategy
Medline 1966–10/01 using the OVID interface. (exp knee OR exp knee injuries OR exp knee joint OR exp medial collateral ligament,knee OR knee.mp) AND (exp hemarthrosis OR haemarthrosis.mp OR hemarthrosis.mp OR effusion.mp OR exp synovial fluid OR synovial fluid.mp) AND (exp aspiration OR aspiration.mp. OR aspirate$.mp OR exp drainage OR drain.mp OR drains.mp OR exp emergency treatment OR exp treatment failure OR exp treatment outcome OR treatment.mp. OR treat$.mp) AND maximally sensitive RCT filter LIMIT to human AND English.

Search outcome
Altogether 267 papers found of which none were relevant to the original question.

Comment(s)
Despite the fact that many clinicians hold firm views about this matter, there is no published evidence to inform a decision.

▲ CLINICAL BOTTOM LINE
Local advice should be followed.