

A S GOLDIE

Intensive Care Unit, Yorkhill Hospital, Glasgow

- 1 Piat V, Dubois M-C, Johanet S, Murat I. Induction and recovery characteristics and haemodynamic responses to sevoflurane and halothane in children. *Anesth Analg* 1994;79:840-4.
- 2 Binstock WB, Berkowitz R, Eyrich K, Hannallah RS, Apfelbaum JL. A comparison of sevoflurane and halothane for induction and maintenance of anesthesia in pediatric ASA I and II outpatients. *Anesthesiology* 1994;81:A1313.

Traumatic pericardial tamponade

EDITOR,—We agree with Crawford *et al*¹ 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 are immediately 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 was 100%.² Similarly, in a report by Ma *et al* of 245 patients who had ultrasound carried out by emergency physicians, the sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy were 100%, 99%, and 99% respectively.³

Freshman and his colleagues⁴ 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*.¹ 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 pericardiotomy (100%, 89%, and 90% respectively).⁵

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.

P E CHIQUITO

C L MUWANGA

R K BANERJEE

M JONES

D R PARKINS

Accident and Emergency Department, Sunderland General Hospital, Sunderland, Tyne and Wear

- 1 Crawford R, Kasem H, Bleetman A. Traumatic pericardial tamponade: relearning old lessons. *J Accid Emerg Med* 1997;14:252-4.
- 2 Rozycki GS, Feliciano DV, Schmidt JA. The role of surgeon-performed ultrasound in patients with possible cardiac wounds. *Ann Surg* 1996; 223:737-44.
- 3 Ma OJ, Mateer JR, Ogata M. Prospective analysis of a rapid trauma ultrasound examination performed by emergency physicians. *J Trauma* 1995;38:879-85.
- 4 Freshman SP, Wisner DH, Weber CJ. 2-D Echocardiography to detect occult cardiac injury after penetrating precordial trauma. *J Trauma* 1991;31:902-6.
- 5 Meyer DM, Jessen ME, Grayburn PA. Use of echocardiography to detect occult cardiac injury after penetrating thoracic trauma: a prospective study. *J Trauma* 1995;39:902-6.

SHOs' interpretation of x rays

EDITOR,—The article by McLauchlan *et al* on x ray interpretation by A&E SHOs¹ 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 20% could not be identified by senior clinicians. 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 pejorative 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.

A M LEAMAN

Princess Royal Hospital NHS Trust, Telford, Shropshire TF6 6TF

- 1 McLauchlan CA, Jones K, Guly H. Interpretation of trauma radiographs by junior doctors in accident and emergency departments: a cause for concern. *J Accid Emerg Med* 1997;14:295-8.

The author replies

I agree with Mr Alan Leaman up to a point, in that there was an element of unreality in the quiz, but I do not think it was pejorative or derogatory to junior staff but rather encouraged further support for them.

Mr Leaman is correct in that the x rays were uncommon and sometimes difficult to diagnose (and not scoring 100% myself I strongly agree!) but they were all significant in that correct diagnosis would lead to important changes in the patient's management. As we discussed in the paper, detailed clinical information was not provided and this reduced the realism for junior doctors, although less so for the radiologists. The readers will have to judge for themselves whether they feel this was unscientific.

Although 20% of the abnormalities were not identified by senior clinicians, there was variation and for some films for which the senior doctors scored 100% correct, the juniors still scored poorly—for example, only 12% correctly identified perilunar dislocation,

34% elbow effusion, and 46% comminuted calcaneal fracture. These significant injuries are difficult to diagnose and many of us in A&E suspect that they are therefore likely to be missed by junior doctors working on their own. The idea of the paper was to document this more accurately and I think it does. At the same time we hoped it would act as further argument for providing juniors with greater support and training (as well as improved risk management) rather than being pejorative. I feel that analysing our errors and devising ways to overcome these is more important than fears of derisory comments from "those hostile to our specialty."

Mr Leaman mentions "missed fracture" audits, and I agree it is important to review these for feedback. However, statistically this is not very meaningful as any percentage error is bound to be small since most of the x rays are normal anyway, and the doctor's x ray threshold is an important variable. It is more accurate to look at the percentage of abnormal x rays that are missed. In our study, part of the point was that many of the important abnormalities were uncommon and SHOs on their own may only see one or two examples of each in their six months.

I certainly agree with Mr Leaman that our SHOs do a fine job but this paper emphasises that they need support and other systems to reduce the error rate.

CHRIS A J McLAUHLAN

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.¹ We too use 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 the presentations.

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 Word-Perfect. Participants are also advised on 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 evaluations (trainees only). The Word and Powerpoint files are copied from the presenter's