Ukraine is indeed a geopolitically diverse nation. There is much history and understandable thirst for true freedom and servant leadership. Ukrainians haven't had much of that kind of leadership.

Consider the Holodomor in 1932–1933 when Stalin starved millions to death in Ukraine over a squabble with Ukraine's farmers; the many more millions who died in World War II, their own Holocaust, and the deaths caused by not only Hitler but by Stalin; and Stalin deporting the Crimean Tatars en masse to Central Asia after World War II and Russians put in Crimea in their place. The list goes on and on.
Timing is everything in the emergency room. But for women of childbearing age, many medical procedures must wait until these patients have been tested for pregnancy.
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The Official Voice of Emergency Medicine
What four words can ignite excitement?

I’m going to ACEP!
Section of Careers in Emergency Medicine Calls for Essays for Longevity and Tenure Awards

The ACEP Section of Careers in Emergency Medicine is recognizing longevity in the specialty and is asking for nominations for awards to be given in two categories:

- Longevity Award for the physician with the longest active career in emergency medicine
- Tenure Award for the physician with the longest active career in the same emergency department

Recognition also will be given to those physicians who are still actively practicing emergency medicine after 20, 25, 30, and 35 years. To be eligible, prospective recipients must have worked an average of 1,000 or more hours per year in emergency medicine practice or teaching. Hours for residency training and administration are not included. Nominees also must be current ACEP members.

Previous applicants may apply every year. However, they may not win the same award within a five-year period. Please submit a full historical sketch. For example, “Attending Emergency Physician, June 1974 to December 1979,” is acceptable and must include details of the entire career along with a brief essay (300 words or fewer) about why the nominee made emergency medicine a career. Award recipients will be recognized during the section meeting at ACEP14 in Chicago this fall. Additional recognition will be given in the section newsletter.

To be considered for the awards, nominations must be received by July 18, 2014. Submit your application to:

Cathey Wise
Section of Careers in Emergency Medicine, ACEP
PO Box 619911
Dallas, TX 75261-9911
Fax: 972-580-2816
Email: careers.section@acep.org

Apply Now to Serve on an ACEP Committee

ACEP President-Elect Michael J. Gerardi, MD, FACEP, has announced the beginning of the selection process for appointing members to serve on national ACEP committees during fiscal year 2014–15. Members interested in serving on a national ACEP committee are asked to contact Mary Ellen Fletcher, CPC, CEDC, at 800-798-1822, ext. 3145, or mfletcher@acep.org. The committee interest form is also available on ACEP’s website at http://webapps.acep.org/Membership/committeeinterest.aspx.

The deadline for submitting committee interest forms to Ms. Fletcher is May 19, 2014. Dr. Gerardi will finalize the committee appointments in June.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Fletcher at 800-798-1822, ext. 3145, or mfletcher@acep.org.
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With the EZ-IO System, getting immediate vascular access for DVA patients is:
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An Ounce of Prevention

This is in response to the pro-con debate on asset protection (“Afraid of Getting Sued and Losing Everything? Well, Just Hide Your Money! Or Not!” February ACEP Now, p. 20).

First of all, thanks to Drs. Frank and Segan for an interesting pro-con feature on a subject that is on almost every ED physician’s mind to some degree.

I would like to respond to Dr. Frank’s viewpoint. I have known a physician who lost his house and many of his assets due to an excess malpractice verdict. He was an obstetrician, and he historically have huge liability risks, but this did ruin him financially and emotionally, not to mention what this did to his family.

Second, I think Dr. Frank makes the case for good asset protection. He states (and I summarize) that most plaintiff attorneys will not be interested in going after the personal assets of a physician because (as in example 1, where the verdict was $5 million and the physician had $1 million in coverage) “the chances of getting $5 million (or anything close to that) from most physicians are slim to none.” What I take from this is that the chances are truly “slim to none” of taking some or all of the physician’s assets if the physician has engaged in an effective, reasonable asset-protection plan. I bet the plaintiff attorney would not be so merciful if, as with physician B in Dr. Segan’s example, the physician had his assets in unprotected, easily confiscatable forms.

Third, one issue that is not addressed by Dr. Frank is the dread and anxiety one faces when served with those awful papers. The amount of anxiety and stress that accompany a lawsuit is underappreciated and often makes physicians question the career they chose. Even with the fact that most physicians prevail, there is always the chance (even with excellent medical care) that you will be the unlucky one who has a jury who forgets the facts and sides with the perceived victim.

Having a good asset-protection plan, which may be expensive, is worth the money. Most things of value are, even if it is to protect you from the chance, albeit small, that you are the one who has “had [your] assets taken away by an excess verdict.” The peace of mind that comes from protection against the sometimes illogical and unjust whims of the legal system is something that most physicians would find worth having.

Dr. Frank is correct; asset protection costs money and can be expensive, especially if done well. However, for most physicians, it is money well spent.

—Stephen F. Spontak, MD, ABEM Homer Glen, Ill.

At ACEPNow.com, Alyssa Berns of Buckhannon, W.V., asked:

“In chronic-pain patients who have been properly screened for addiction risk using the Opioid Risk Tool (see Table 1), the risk of addiction for those who are scored at low risk is less than 0.2 percent”

That 0.2 percent is a great stat! Does anyone know where exactly it comes from?

In response to the great question from Alyssa Berns, here are my comments.

The data on risk have been accumulated in our nine community-based chronic non-cancer pain clinics over a period of three years. In our clinics, we average 60,000 visits per year, representing approximately 8,000 patients. All patients fill out the Opioid Risk Tool (ORT), along with many other validated assessment forms, at the time of entry into the clinics. Patients also sign an opioid agreement and are required to undergo random urine drug screening at a frequency determined by that initial risk stratification (anywhere from two per year to monthly).

Our patient retention is high, so we have fairly consistent evidence with respect to compliance and substance misuse. Others, however, have not reported such consistency in the value of any screening tool they have used. Witkin et al (J Opioid Manag. 2013;9:177-187) found that 38 percent of their low-risk patients had aberrant drug-related behavior (ADB). It is important to note that ADB is not the equivalent of addiction and represents acting-out behavior seen both with opioid-use disorder and addiction.

The Canadian Opioid Guideline (cited in the article) recommends the use of the ORT to establish baseline risk; it is the preferred screening tool at present. Another tool, the Drug Abuse Screening Test (DAST-20), specifically looks at presence of addiction risk at the point in time of seeing the patient rather than predicting risk in the future, as the ORT is meant...
Most everything in the ACA are proposals or initiatives that were already underway, started by various constituents in politics, business, and health policy.

Facing, and Embracing, the Facts

Obamacare isn’t the root of all ills in health care today—bigger changes are cresting and spell opportunity

by RICARDO MARTINEZ, MD, FACEP

One of my favorite passion plays unfolds on CNBC from time to time. It usually involves a CEO of a company that has risen mainly because the market itself has done very well. He or she is revered and called a genius. A few months later, the stock begins to plummet, and the same CEO spends the next interview vigorously assigning blame for the stock decline. Routinely, the culprits are the government, the media, the short sellers, and the lawyers. Personally, I think it’s the lawyers, but if the CEO wants to find the real culprit, someone should hand them a mirror.

Even bad managers can do well in a good market, and these CEOs simply missed big trends that were obvious to their competitors. Poor insight does not lend itself to effective strategies for sustainability and growth.

In the same way, there are health care leaders who react to changes by hysterically screaming “Obamacare” at the top of their lungs rather than really understanding long-term trends that have been under way long before the Affordable Care Act (ACA). I can certainly understand politicians doing this because facts, although interesting, seem irrelevant to many of them. But educated health care leaders missing the big trends is a harder sell for me. Shouldn’t they be leading?

Let’s look at some those trends that have been occurring simply because we are at an inflection point for the health care system as a whole. The health care system wasn’t always what it is today and has been constantly evolving, especially since the turn of the century. However, today’s changes are happening faster than ever before. The transition to new financial and care models is largely built on large-scale changes in society that include increasing consumerism, greater price transparency, rapidly emerging technologies, hard financial realities, and changes in social demographics. Legislation has little to do with these trends.

The ACA rollout is clunky at best. It has to be changed and surely will be, but most major policy implementations are rocky. What the ACA attempted to do was reverse the effects of a market that allowed exclusion criteria that distorted risk pools so health insurance became either difficult to get or incredibly expensive. Most everything in the ACA are proposals or initiatives that were already underway, started by various constituents in politics, business, and health policy. The ACA has certainly increased the speed of that change, and we all know how much we love change in health care. So let’s look at a few common claims about Obamacare and separate long-term trends that have been occurring and will occur no matter what happens to the ACA.

The law is causing a shortage of physicians!

The truth is that there has been a worldwide shortage of physicians for decades. In fact, this was a concern when I was a medical student (I’m a PGY 3/4), and we haven’t meaningfully addressed the issue yet. There was a short time when we had additional medical school spots in the 1980s. However, the funding for that dried up. Graduate medical education slots have been decreasing since the 1990s, so we now have medical school graduates waiting for residency positions. Predictions of a physician shortage by 2020 have been a focus of major articles in the early 2000s, but what I learned from my time in Washington, D.C., is that policymakers often don’t want to deal with difficult issues until there is a crisis. Congratulations, here’s your crisis.

The law is causing business to cut health care benefits.

Oh, please. “Business” only got into health care benefits in the 1940s because wages were frozen and benefits were provided to get around the wage freeze and compete for employees. Since health care insurance costs started escalating rapidly, businesses have looked for ways to insulate themselves from those huge variations. We’ve seen businesses move from defined benefits, meaning that they would pay for certain benefits, to defined contributions, meaning that they would contribute a finite amount of dollars to employee benefits and employees could pick from a menu of benefits or pay the difference. This is driving the growth of private health benefits exchanges. I know of no person, employer, or insurer who wants to pay a penny more for health care. Do you? For business, it is all about containing costs.

The law will cause a crisis in primary care.

In most countries, there are three generalists to each specialist. Therefore, access to primary care is much easier. In the U.S., that ratio is reversed, with three specialists per generalist, putting a squeeze on access to a generalist. That ratio has nothing to do with recent legislation but evolved over time and has become unsustainable. Simply put, specialty care pays well and allows growth in expertise in a narrow area, so physicians have chosen those career paths. We are just now recognizing, and rewarding, the value of those in primary care. Too little too late? In today’s world, most generalists don’t admit patients, preferring to have emergency physicians and hospitalists care for their patients. Let’s take that opening and run with it.

The new law makes people pay more out-of-pocket.

Have you been sleeping? For decades, we’ve seen the rise of the patient as a payer class, but somehow, health care providers have ignored it. The rising copay for emergency department services was created to incentivize people to go elsewhere, despite the fact that they have nowhere else to go because regular physician practice office hours don’t meet the needs of patients after hours and on weekends. Insurance companies have designed benefits with higher copays for emergency departments as “value based insurance,” incenting the patient to go to less expensive care sources.

In 2003, President George W. Bush signed legislation that started health savings accounts (HSAs) and encouraged the growth of high-deductible health plans that had lower premiums and allowed consumers to keep the savings that were not spent in their HSA. The rapid rise of high-deductible health plans over the years has put the “first dollar” coverage on the consumer, essentially making the patient a payer source. This summer, the American Medical Association reported that 23-24 percent of physician payments came from the patients themselves. That trend is likely to continue, and increasingly, we will see patients change their patterns of access to care and their choices of care. Let’s let them choose EM when it’s the best option.

These changes were responses by payers to perceived overutilization of expensive and unnecessary care, creating a move to value-based care and driving growth of retail and urgent care clinics for acute care needs. Let’s face it: the deductibles have gotten so high that patients simply won’t pay large bills. It’s a bit ironic that physicians and hospitals started health insurance back in the 1930s because patients couldn’t afford to pay their bills. Now, we’ve come full circle.

But facing these facts provides opportunity to thrive. I predict that there will still be patients and they will need our care. The opportunity here is to design cheaper alternatives for care by emergency physicians and an “EM team,” anywhere and anytime. If not, I can guarantee you that someone in Silicon Valley or Nashville is working on that solution right now—and at a profit. Now is a great time to lead these changes and redesign emergency care for all of our patients.

DR. MARTINEZ is chief medical officer and vice president of North Highland Worldwide Consulting and assistant professor of emergency medicine at Emory University School of Medicine, both in Atlanta. He attends at Grady Memorial Hospital.
WHAT WILL HOSPITAL MERGER MANIA MEAN FOR EMERGENCY MED?

The big keep getting bigger when it comes to hospitals and health systems—and how that affects emergency physicians remain to be seen.

This year’s Community Health Systems (CHS) of Franklin, Tenn., completed its $3.9 billion acquisition of Health Management Associates (HMA), based in North Naples, Fla. CHS now owns, leases, or operates 206 hospitals in 29 states, making it the country’s largest for-profit hospital operator ranked by number of hospitals.

The merger was blessed by the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), but only after CHS agreed to sell Riverview Regional Medical Center in Gadsden, Ala., and Carolina Pines Regional Medical Center in Hartselle, Ala., and related assets in both markets. The FTC said that, had those institutions been included in the merger, there would have been reduced competition in those areas.

That FTC decision to force that sale came at the same time a federal judge decided that St. Luke’s Health System of Boise, Idaho, could not continue to own a multi-specialty medical group, Saltzer Medical Group of Nampa, Idaho. The FTC and others sued late last year to unwind St. Luke’s 2012 acquisition, saying “the combination of St. Luke’s and Saltzer would give it the market power to demand higher rates for health care services provided by primary care physicians in Nampa, Idaho, and surrounding areas, ultimately leading to higher costs for health care consumers.”

The judge agreed, and the case was highlighted as one that may change the future of health systems merging with local physician groups to integrate more services. It also, in effect, laid out the clear juxtaposition between the current merger trend: health systems continue to look to add services and size as Medicare reimbursement payments slowly but surely move toward population health strategies and fiscal efficiencies driven by economies of scale.

But the frenetic pace of mergers—CHS alone has struck more than two dozen deals in the past seven years, according to the New York Times—means that smaller hospitals or medical groups may not be able to compete as a handful of regional or national firms dominate the landscape. It’s a deli- cate balance aimed at providing the consumer, but not from a position that eliminates consumer choice or gives one system the ability to negotiate higher reimbursement rates from health insurance plans that will ultimately be passed on to the consumer, the judge in the Idaho case wrote.

For emergency physicians at acquired hospitals or medical groups, immediate fears typically range from staff reductions to lessened hospital support from a less local owner. But in markets across the country where CHS has acquired HMA hospitals, executives are saying that’s not the case.

“This transaction provides us with increased scale and broader geographic reach as we work to create strong health care networks across the nation,” CHS chairman and chief executive officer Wayne Smith said in a news release when the merger consummated. “Our larger organization is well positioned to address the changing dynamics in our industry and dedicated to providing quality care for millions of patients and all the communities we serve.”

Still, the Idaho case—which St. Luke’s has said it intends to appeal—highlights that the continued pace of growing hospital systems is likely to be the focus of attention.

The ruling “is a significant victory for the Federal Trade Commission,” Jonathan Lewis, an antitrust attorney at Baker Botts in Washington, D.C., told the Idaho Statesman newspaper, “and should serve as a clear signal to hospitals looking to, and those that have already, acquired physician groups.”

MEDICARE AUDITS CREATE MORE HEADACHES, DELAYS

Consultants and billing experts say emergency physicians and the hospitals they work in are increasingly frustrated with the growing length of the entire audit process—including getting paid back for denied claims that have successfully appealed.

James Blakeman, senior vice president of the billing company Emergency Groups’ Office in Arcadia, Calif., said that delayed reimbursements can be damaging to hospitals, in particular, as those amounts are typically for hundreds of thousands of dollars. While individual payment denials to emergency physicians are “not usually material to a practice’s financial viability,” the implications of multiple held-up payments can be significant physicians have no choice but to fight them, he said.

“Physicians cannot simply concede an audit if they know they are right because Medicare claims that these are all ‘educational,’” Mr. Blakeman said, adding, “You are made to feel like you have committed fraud and that someday they could say, ‘We told you before that you were billing in error, now we are going to audit a larger level because you acknowledged (by not contesting before) that you were coding incorrect-ly.’ That result could be disastrous. Injustice and fear of future audits are what haunt emergency physicians when they think about billing Medicare and Medicaid.”

Practicing emergency physician John Stimler, DO, CPC, CHC, FACEP, a founder and managing member of health care consultant Bettinger, Stimler & Associates of Pinecrest, Fla., said he hears of too many groups that don’t defend themselves. While he doesn’t approve of that, he said it is understandable given the staffing and resources burden mounting an aggressive defense.

“A lot of groups give up because they don’t want to spend the money to do it,” said Dr. Stimler, a member of ACEP’s Reimbursement Commit- tee. “It becomes a double-, or triple-, or quadruple-edged sword. You not only lose the money between the code choices, but you have to pay for the staff to defend yourself. All those steps are expensive.”

The process is also time consuming. If a hospital, physician group, or solo practitioner wants to appeal a Recovery Audit Contractor decision, it has 120 days to file what is known as a “redetermination,” which is conducted by Medicare carriers or MACs. While the appeal deadline is 120 days, one can only avoid a Medicare recoupment action if the appeal is filed within 30 days. A second level of appeal is known as “reconsideration,” and is conducted by Qualified Independent Contractors (QICs). Then a case can be appealed to an administrative law judge. Above that level, appeals can be filed to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services or a federal court.

“You are talking about issues that may drag on for longer than a year,” Dr. Stimler said.

Most cases stop at the administra- tive law judge level, however, the timeline to get there has grown dra- matically. In a memo released earlier this year, Nancy Griswold, the chief judge of the Office of Medicare Hearings and Appeals, suspend- ed scheduling new hearings. She wrote, “We do not expect general assignments to resume for at least 24 months.” In a related hearing before Congress, Ms. Griswold present- ed data showing that that received appeals more than doubled, from 117,371 in fiscal year 2012 to 350,629 in fiscal year 2013. Decided appeals rose from 61,517, to 79,303 in the same period, a 29% increase that couldn’t keep pace.

“Hence the big complaint that it’s taking forever for appeals to get resolved because the OMHA is overwhelmed,” said Mr. Blakeman.

“This is as bad as it’s ever been,” said Denise Wilson, assistant vice president of consulting firm Appeal Masters of Lutherville, Md.

For Mr. Blakeman, the biggest impact on emergency physicians is “the injustice of it.”

“The audit process is broken,” he said. “Emergency physicians feel that you try to do the right thing for the patient but you can still lose your [Medicare] billing privileges if an auditor just has a bad day and picks you to unload all his or her mistakes on that day. It’s just not right. And the defense costs are unnecessary. We pay the cost of the federal audit process being poorly run.”

We, as clinicians, cannot judge in a few minutes why the patient is manifesting ADRB...To help us better judge, validated tools and objective testing should be to what we turn.
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to do. In Gorchynsky et al (C J Emerg Med. 2005;6:3-8), the DAST20 identified 50 percent of the patients with addiction who would not have been identified by the clinician. This tool may be another one to consider.

Caveat: as per Brown et al (J Opioid Manag. 2011;7:467-483), the majority of patients seen in a family practice do not fall into the low-risk category; I would assume that would be equally true in the ED. Assessment of risk of addiction could be fast and done along with the subjective (and biased) assessment of the caregiver; the latter has been shown to be fraught with error. Urine drug testing can also be of value: no one already testing positive for cocaine, for example, should be leaving any ED with a prescription for any controlled substance. The other important objective resource is the state-based drug-monitoring programs that allow us to see who has received what prescriptions.

There is, thus, no perfect way to assess risk. Use of an objective tool plus minus urine drug testing does shift the weight toward a more objective assessment. The best example I can provide is that roughly 40 percent of patients presenting with a vaso-occlusive crisis are found to have ADRB—not surpris- ing given the poor pain management most

RICHARD QUINN is a freelance writer in New Jersey.
A Complex and Dangerous Situation

As this is written, Putin is occupying Crimea with some 18,000 troops and many armaments. The average Ukrainian is very worried about Putin’s ambition and aggressiveness, according to Sergei Bolyukh, MD, a friend and general surgeon in Vinnytsa, Ukraine. There is fear that Putin will move even further into Ukraine under the pretense of protecting Russian-centric Ukrainians from the temporary Ukrainian government appointed by the Rada (parliament) upon former President Yanukovych’s departure from Kyiv to Russia. There is, per Sergei and the international media, no evidence that the Russian-centric Ukrainians are in any peril of any kind. In fact, with the call for a new presidential election to take place May 25, the hope of the majority of Ukrainians is to continue a path to true freedom and unity. Unity is stressed and is key to Sergei and to Ukraine. This is not to the exclusion of a peaceful relationship with neighboring Russia but specifically to include that relationship, but in a way that respects established internationally recognized borders.

It is understood that Putin is keen to maintain the Russian Black Sea fleet in Russia’s only warm seaport, Sevastopol, which Russia has leased until 2042. Ukraine may need to extend that indefinitely as part of any accord moving forward. However, the blunt truth, per Sergei and others in Ukraine with whom I have spoken, is that they feel like Putin is being allowed to “rape us.” They feel the EU and the United States are being too slow and not harsh enough with sanctions and in isolating Putin. The Russian people in Russia have a long tradition of powerful leaders who they seldom stand up to, even if they are unsure of their leader’s wisdom. At this moment, Ukrainians live in fear for their future as a free country.

It is one thing to watch the news on TV, to have numerous Facebook posts shared with you, to watch the Internet news and various TV reporting. Today everything is so “out there,” so different from Sergei’s and my younger years. But when Sergei and I spoke on Feb. 20, and he told me that his son, a neurosurgeon, had been manning a medical tent at the Maidan and that his son was in tears, I knew things had really worsened. To hear Sergei ask for my prayers and those of my family ... well... I cried, too.

When Sergei and I spoke on Feb. 20, and he told me that his son, a neurosurgeon, had been manning a medical tent at the Maidan and that his son was in tears, I knew things had really worsened ... To hear Sergei ask for my prayers and those of my family ... well... I cried, too.

How Ukraine Became Important to Me

In April 1996, long before the ACEP International Section launched the Ambassador Program to facilitate international emergency medicine collaboration worldwide, I made my first trip to Ukraine. My wife, Catherine, and I had experienced a spiritual awakening, and our church was sending a family to live in Vinnytsya, Ukraine. The link was a family having moved from Vinnytsya to Franklin, Tenn., and sharing with their new church in America, where my wife and I are members, the needs of Ukraine as the nation was emerging from the Soviet era as a newly independent nation (as of 1991). I distinctly remember stepping off the airplane in Kyiv that first trip and feeling like I had landed in enemy territory, not because of the people—they were warm, although initially guarded—but because, after all, my sixth-grade class was repeatedly marched to the fallout shelter because of the Cuban Missile Crisis. So going to a part of the former Soviet Union was a mixture of anticipation, excitement, and some concern.

CONTINUED on page 10
Many in Ukraine resist the notion of becoming a modern-day version of a Soviet republic. Regardless of what else might happen, we should all hope and pray that Ukraine achieves true freedom and finds true servant leaders.

ACEP International

The roughly 10-year-old ACEP International Ambassador program is a wonderful opportunity to serve in international emergency medicine, whether it is in Ukraine or in numerous other countries around the world. The program was launched in 2004 as a means of organizing and further developing and coordinating many efforts already taking place among ACEP members in international emergency medicine. The field of international emergency medicine has since grown greatly in scope, with dozens of international emergency medicine fellowships now existing in the United States and abroad. ACEP’s international Emergency Medicine Section provides all forms of networking and leadership to deepen the work of collaboration worldwide. In this coming year, we will see the development of the international liaison physician program within our ambassador program. This will facilitate ACEP membership by EM physician leaders from other countries served by the ACEP Ambassador program.

I encourage all ACEP members to become members of the International Section and to find their niche. Look at our blog at www.ukrainemedicalmission.com to gain more insight on outreach to Ukraine. We anticipate our next trip to occur in September 2016. You might want to participate.

A friend of mine once told me that, in going to Ukraine to help others, he had learned the difference between success and significance. I encourage you to find out that difference firsthand for yourself.

Dr. McMurray is medical director of the Wayne Medical Center Emergency Department in Waynesboro, Tenn., and medical director of First Stop Urgent Care in Columbia, Tenn. He is the ACEP International Ambassador to Ukraine. Since 1996, he and his wife, Catherine, and their three daughters all have been to Ukraine, initially on trips focused on helping orphanages.

Medical collaboration over these 18 years has taken on many forms: the honor of speaking at Pirogov Medical University in 1996 on HIV emergencies; collaboration with that university and with teams of other American or Canadian doctors on educational programs; sponsoring Ukrainians needing heart surgery as their nation’s heart surgeons developed greater expertise; launching a program in 1998 for the use of high-dose ACE inhibitors for systolic heart failure; bringing Ukrainian doctors to Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, where they were welcomed by the dean and Department of Emergency Medicine; hosting Dr. Georgiy Roshchin of Ukraine’s Disaster Medicine Program in Denver at ACEP 2012; working with churches that run drug and alcohol rehab centers; assisting doctors and nurses in providing care at desolate orphanages; and sending more than 20 containers full of medical supplies and equipment to Ukraine through Project C.U.R.E. of Denver and Nashville.

Well, you get the idea—this has been my passion. During the last several trips, it has been a treat to travel far and wide in Ukraine with a new friend, Vitaliy Krylyuk, MD, the chair of the Ukraine Resuscitation Society; Vitaliy ushered us from city to city across Ukraine as we presented “Highlights of ACLS, PALS, NALS, and ATLS.” The last trip in September 2013 took us from Kyiv to Ternopil, Lviv, Vinnytsa, Mohyliv-Podilskyi, and finally to Sudak in Crimea. Joining me were Sergei; our translator, Ruslan Tschachuk (who, along with his wife, runs a foster home in Nemia, Ukraine, on the Moldovan border); and American doctors Michelle Sergel, MD, of Cook County Chicago, Shannon Langston, MD, of Vanderbilt EM and a former international fellow there; and Mark McLean, MD, a fellow TeamHealth leader of Maury Regional EM in Columbia, Tenn (see photo). All of us have been in agony watching the recent events unfold, especially since we were so recently traveling through Crimea.

As Ukraine reaches for freedom, its people worry and pray
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But my concerns were replaced by warmth when I met Sergei and his family. Over the years, Sergei has met my family, too, and visited our home. He is a graduate of Pirogov Medical University in Vinnytsa, and was the first surgeon in Vinnytsya Oblast to agree to operate on known HIV-positive patients. Since we first met in 1996, he has developed a strong outreach to poor patients and HIV-positive patients and those recovering from alcohol and/or drug addiction.

We had both had a spiritual awakening not long before we first met. He was born in 1949 and I in 1952. We were “Cold War” kids. He had been a leader of the Communist Party medical wing in Vinnytsya Oblast. I was a kid who grew up in a GM family, moving often until I settled outside Detroit in the early 1960s. Then I went on to university and medical school and to a relatively wealthy existence compared to Sergei’s. Could we have been more different? What were the odds that we would become best friends?

That was 32 trips ago. Having spent well over a year of my life in all areas of Ukraine, I can say that it is indeed my second home. Their emergency physicians ride on ambulances. They don’t work in the hospital as we do. What a fascination it has been to ride in ambulances with their doctors in cities across their nation. On one such ambulance run, the patient was a former Soviet army general with chest pain. He had never had an American in his home. He formally commanded an Intercontinental Ballistic Missile facility where the missiles were all aimed at America. By the end of the visit we hugged. It’s a true joy to break down walls.
Bad Outcomes Occur. Malpractice Need Not.
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DISCUSSION PARTICIPANTS

Mark L. Mackey, MD, MBA, FACEP, ACEP Board Member
Rebecca B. Parker, MD, FACEP, ACEP Board Member
Andrew E. Sama, MD, FACEP, ACEP Chair of the Board and Immediate Past President
Dean, 
Thanks for forwarding….unfortunate that medial liability reform/safe harbors got no mentions…the take home seems to be: “If only these ED docs could do a physical exam.”

—Mark L. Mackey, MD, MBA, FACEP, ACEP Board Member

Yes, and we can’t seem to shake the title “ER physician” instead of emergency physician. We haven’t been holed up in a “room” for a long time.

—Rebecca B. Parker, MD, FACEP, ACEP Board Member

Unfortunately, no professional liability discussion. What is the acceptable miss rate? Where are the safe harbors, etc., etc.? We should draft a thoughtful editorial comment. We have been working hard on making progress on utilization issues.

—Andrew E. Sama, MD, FACEP, ACEP Chair of the Board and Immediate Past President

I think it would be interesting to pose this question to the trial attorneys whether the Choosing Wisely recommendations constitute safe harbors. Let’s have somebody else debate this issue rather than us trying to make a statement that may appear to be self-serving. I wonder what the president of ATLA [the Association of Trial Lawyers of America] would say.

—Paul D. Kivela, MD, FACEP, ACEP Secretary-Treasurer

This article was discovered by Michael Baldyga, ACEP public relations manager, and forwarded to Dean Wilkerson, ACEP Executive Director; Alexander Rosenau, ACEP President; and Michael Gerardi, ACEP President-Elect. The “think tank” erupted with a fury of interaction and communication over a 96-hour period.

It is important to recognize the raw nature of this work and see this for what it is: issue identification, rapid dissemination, and brainstorming. It is not a completed work and includes most, but not all, comments submitted. In the coming months, solutions will be investigated to support the interests and needs of emergency physicians and our patients.

KEVIN M. KLAUER, DO, EJD, FACEP, is director of the Center for Emergency Medical Education (CEME) and chief medical officer for Emergency Medicine Physicians, Ltd, Canton, Ohio; on the Board of Directors for Physicians Specialty Limited Risk Retention Group; assistant clinical professor at Michigan State University College of Osteopathic Medicine; and medical editor in chief of ACEP Now.
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Let’s move forward and try something different. Let’s establish safe harbors and advertise that this will save waste from the system ... Safe harbors to improve patient safety and decrease health care costs.

— ACEP Secretary-Treasurer Paul D. Kivela, MD, FACEP

As per my reply to Dean, this is all about risk benefit continuum or spectrum—in other words, how much certainty for how many dollars cost for the patient and how much risk for doing or not doing the test or procedure, which entails health risk for the patient and medical liability and career risk for the physician.

Medical liability must be addressed. Agree with Sama, a letter to the editor that clarifies that issue would be appropriate.

—Alexander M. Rosenau, DO, FACEP, ACEP President

My question is perhaps a philosophical one. It doesn’t seem to matter if it’s right or if it’s wrong but how it is perceived. So why do we continue to self-advocate as it rarely seems to be effective in changing public opinion? I think we need to go and try something different from time to time. It seems like we are writing too many letters to editors to clarify misperceptions.

I would rather have articles written in our favor the first time around. What about pitching this to the LA Times if not The Wall Street Journal and having them ask the trial attorneys how they feel about safe harbors for Choosing Wisely measures. For balance, they can ask the insurance companies and the regulators.

—Paul D. Kivela, MD, FACEP, ACEP Secretary-Treasurer

Think Paul has struck a nerve.

Recently, an ACEP leader gave a talk about “What I learned in Washington.” It was illuminating. He says no one cares what we think. If we say it, then it is automatically seen as being self-serving and not to be trusted. [Politicians] want recommendations and data from impartial sources.

There were several other things he learned about how they think, how they view physicians, how they make decisions, etc. I’ve asked him to put his observations down as a report to the ACEP Board of Directors. Hope he does.

—John J. Rogers, MD, FACEP, ACEP Board Member

Great point, Paul, and good feedback, John.

Is there a way to change the conversation back to patient advocacy? Most patients want to see the system get better/improve (eg, heparin and Dennis Quaid’s twins). Any studies out there that safe harbors allow for more error reporting, error reduction efforts, and open conversations when issues occur? It represents an agreement with physicians and patients that we commit to following evidence-based decision making whenever possible, understanding the risks.

—Rebecca B. Parker, MD, FACEP, ACEP Board Member

My understanding is there are safe harbors in just about any other field, from construction to accounting. Why don’t we establish safe harbors and say that ACEP recommends the following safe harbors? Reality is that there’s no such thing as a medical malpractice case, or any malpractice case, without an expert witness saying that something has deviated from the standard of care.

Let’s move forward and try something different. Let’s establish safe harbors and advertise that this will save waste from the system. I say we just establish that ACEP determines the standard of care consensus-wise for emergency medicine. We need to come up with the campaign slogan and go with it and see what happens. Doesn’t mean you can’t do more, but you will be protected if you do what is the recommendation. I don’t think it needs to be any more complex or complicated than this, and I don’t think we have to ask for anybody’s approval. Let’s be bold.

Safe harbors to improve patient safety and decrease health care costs.

Safe harbors is smart and informed medicine.

—Paul D. Kivela, MD, FACEP, ACEP Secretary-Treasurer

I like the approach of creating safe harbors to give emergency physicians the confidence to practice evidence-based medicine without fear of litigation. This has to be patient-centered so that we are not viewed as self-serving when promoting safe harbors. As a practical matter, could we refer this to the medicolegal committee?

—Robert E. O’Connor, MD, FACEP, ACEP Vice President

I agree with moving forward with creation of safe harbors with appropriate efforts to approach it from a quality perspective with careful attention to not appear speaking from a self-serving perspective. The medicolegal committee might be a good place to start with this.

—Debra G. Perina, MD, FACEP, ACEP Board Member

How do we ensure it does not appear to only be about protecting physicians?

Who would need to recognize the safe harbor? The courts? In every state?

Feds have seemed very uninterested in addressing liability concerns. Then again, if it was a matter of saving them money, they may take more interest.

—John J. Rogers, MD, FACEP, ACEP Board Member
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Defensive medicine is an expensive and unnecessary part of medical practice that does not benefit patients. But doctors have to do it because of the unreasonable and out-of-control liability environment.

— ACEP Executive Director Dean Wilkerson, JD, MBA, CAE
to the media? We would certainly need Laura to craft a great message about how safe harbors are the right thing to do, and we let the other people shoot them down. The worst thing that could happen is that ACEP was proposing cost-saving measures that benefit patients and eliminate unnecessary tests. I think it might be hard politically for ATLAs and even consumer groups to say that safe harbor should not exist, particularly if we pick something very simple and straightforward. Emergency physicians determine the standard of care, and there’s no reason why we should not be able to determine what safe harbors should exist in our field. If we can determine what is unethical and egregious testimony, certainly we should be able to agree on some straightforward, simple safe harbors. Jay [Kaplan’s] list and some of our Choosing Wisely submissions might be a good start, but I’d like to do something with chest pain and POLST [Physician Orders for Life-Sustaining Treatment]. I don’t think we do need to filibuster it. —Paul D. Kivel, MD, FACEP, ACEP Secretary-Treasurer

Maybe not safe harbors, but could we have more transparency around what following the guidelines means in terms of risk? For instance, following PECARN [Pediatric Applied Research Network Head Injury/Trauma Algorithm], 1 in 2,000 kids will have clinically significant traumatic brain injury that will not have been CT’d initially. The “cost” of trying to be perfect is the cost of 1,999 CTs and the subsequent radiation exposure versus the cost of defense/settlement/verdict for the one “miss.” —William Jaquis, MD, FACEP, ACEP Board Member

Bill, Excellent points. I think an important educational point for the layperson is that reducing utilization and cost is the right thing to do, but there are two sides of the equation. Albeit a small percentage, some patients who are exempted by the guideline will have a bad outcome due to missed or delayed diagnoses from not ordering the test. When looking at population data, most, if not all, agree that this is the right thing to do. However, applying this to the individual patient encounter is a very different application of the concept. In other words, most laypersons agree this is the right thing to do. However, their opinions may change when they personally will not receive the test and particularly if they ultimately suffer a bad outcome.

We can reduce cost with a simple pen stroke (oversimplification), but why should the medical legal burden created by following a guideline hit squarely on the shoulders of the providers just trying to follow it? I think this is an important question that could be posed in the lay press and to legislators.

Hence the need for fair compensation with shared risk and shared payout by all of society, not just the provider.

Could this be a case where we seek a cap for non-economic damages?

—Rebecca B. Parker, MD, FACEP, ACEP Board Member

Cogent points, absolutely agree! This conversation needs to be aired. It’s time for an honest debate about what is appropriate and needed, what is not, and how clinical providers can be free to strike that balance for the overall good of society. Answer: Choosing Wisely and Safe Harbors! —James M. Casick, MD, FACEP, ACEP Council Vice Speaker

Becky, It could. However, the medical legal community’s acceptance of such caps is lukewarm, and their effectiveness is debatable. In addition, economic damages (special damages) come from hospital bills, lost future earnings, etc., and they can be huge. So I would not limit our protection to non-economic damages (severe pain, disfigurement, loss of consortium, etc.). I think we are really entitled to true indemnification when we follow such clinical policies correctly and a bad outcome occurs.

I think the problem is even more basic than this. Society does not fathom the actual cost of not having safe harbors; most people just think it is doctors whining and wanting a better deal for ourselves. They do not realize that the cost of medical tort to society is at least $300 billion a year (8 percent of what we spend on health care, between direct and indirect costs).

There is an economic argument that needs to be made since every one of those dollars is paid by consumers of health care. This is true cost savings, not just making it easier for physicians to practice.

—Vidor E. Friedman, MD, FACEP, ACEP Board Member

Apropos to this week’s discussion about safe harbors, I wanted to let you know that two members of the U.S. House of Representatives, Rep. Ami Bera (D-CA) and Rep. Andy Barr (R-KY), have introduced legislation in the House that would establish safe harbors for physicians “who can demonstrate they followed the recommended best practices...”. Those recommended best practices will be developed by the physician community based on the best available scientific evidence. The bill, HR 4106, was introduced yesterday and has been referred to the House Energy & Commerce Committee and the House Judiciary Committee.

We will be discussing this bipartisan bill on next week’s Federal Government Affairs Committee monthly conference call and will presumably recommend that Dr. Rosenau send a letter of support. There will be other opportunities to work with the bill’s sponsors in the coming weeks and months.

—Gordon B. Wheeler, ACEP Associate Executive Director for Public Affairs

Society does not fathom the actual cost of not having safe harbors ...

They do not realize that the cost of medical tort to society is at least $300 billion a year (8 percent of what we spend on health care, between direct and indirect costs).

—Vidor E. Friedman, MD, FACEP
Q. Craig, Illinois just passed the Firearm Concealed Carry Act (PA 98-063), which requires Illinois clinicians to report those they believe pose a “clear and present danger” to themselves or others through the Illinois Firearm Owner’s Identification Mental Health Reporting System. What are your thoughts on the clear and present danger law?

— Rebecca B. Parker, MD, FACEP, attending emergency physician at Presence Covenant Medical Center in Urbana, Ill. She is a member of the ACEP Board of Directors.

A. After doing some quick research, I found that the “clear and present danger” language in Illinois appears to be somewhat unique, although “duty to report” requirements exist for physicians in other states. Most of those requirements are limited to mental health providers, but some mandates have been extended to physicians. New York and Illinois both enacted mandates last year. New York focused on mental health professionals, while Illinois extended the requirement to physicians and other providers.

According to an extensive Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence review of state mental health reporting laws: "New York adopted a law in 2013 requiring reporting by any physician, clinical psychologist, qualified examiner, law enforcement official, or the primary administrator for any school who determines that a person presents a ‘clear and present danger’ to self or others, including any person determined to demonstrate threatening physical or verbal behavior.”

Many states have mandatory duty-to-warn laws in cases where direct threats of violence to others or to self are expressed, and some of these apply to all physicians (including in Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, and New Jersey), according to the National Conference of State Legislatures report of state laws on duty to warn. This information is a year old and does not include the new Illinois law. It notes that some states (including Maryland and Massachusetts) prohibit people who were hospitalized for a mental illness to own a gun unless a physician formally attests that they are not a danger. Texas prohibits concealed handgun permits for any persons who have been diagnosed by a physician with a serious mental condition (including schizophrenia and bipolar disorder) that might impair mood or judgment, with a condition that left them incompetent to handle their own affairs, or with a dependency on alcohol or drugs in the previous five years. However, this information does not indicate a requirement that physicians report patients with those conditions.

For further discussion of the controversy surrounding the issue of reporting and the ability of those treated for mental illness to carry guns, see this story from Kaiser Health News that came out after New York passed its duty-to-report law last year: http://www.kaiserhealthnews.org/stories/2013/march/21/stateline-states-mental-illness-gun-ownership.aspx.

The National Conference of State Legislatures also has a report on state laws related to possession of firearms by people with mental illness (http://www.ncsl.org/research/civil-and-criminal-justice/possession-of-a-firearm-by-the-mentally-ill.aspx). This information is a year old and does not include the new Illinois law. It notes that some states (including Maryland and Massachusetts) prohibit people who were hospitalized for a mental illness to own a gun unless a physician formally attests that they are not a danger. Texas prohibits concealed handgun permits for any persons who have been diagnosed by a physician with a serious mental condition (including schizophrenia and bipolar disorder) that might impair mood or judgment, with a condition that left them incompetent to handle their own affairs, or with a dependency on alcohol or drugs in the previous five years. However, this information does not indicate a requirement that physicians report patients with those conditions.

For further discussion of the controversy surrounding the issue of reporting and the ability of those treated for mental illness to carry guns, see this story from Kaiser Health News that came out after New York passed its duty-to-report law last year: http://www.kaiserhealthnews.org/stories/2013/march/21/stateline-states-mental-illness-gun-ownership.aspx.

A DUTY TO WARN ARISES IF THE PATIENT HAS COMMUNICATED TO THE PRACTITIONER A THREAT OF IMMINENT, SERIOUS PHYSICAL VIOLENCE AGAINST A READILY IDENTIFIABLE INDIVIDUAL OR AGAINST HIMSELF.

BY CRAIG PRICE, CAE

CRAIG PRICE is senior policy director at ACEP.
Better Outcomes and Patient Satisfaction Go Hand in Hand

Beyond surveys and payments, the bottom line is that communication and trust lead to better care

BY JAY A. KAPLAN, MD, FACEP

The words “patient satisfaction” elicit a wide variety of emotions in emergency physicians. Some immediately become angry and feel like the entire concept has been foisted upon them by hospital administrators only interested in market share and the bottom line. Some feel victimized by the move on the part of the federal government and third-party payers to tie payment to quality and patients’ perceptions of their experience. Others feel that the push for patient satisfaction leads to physicians acquiescing to patients and giving them whatever they ask for, including opiate medication prescriptions or advanced imaging studies such as CTs or MRIs, when those prescriptions and diagnostic studies are truly not in patients’ best interests. For some, it is not the concept of patient satisfaction but rather how it is measured and then used as a quality metric to judge physicians that creates concern. However, others believe that patient satisfaction and clinical quality are intimately interdependent and so patient satisfaction is part and parcel of being an outstanding physician.

All of the above feelings have merit and should be addressed by our specialty as we continue to promote excellence in what we do. I have heard my colleagues say the following:

“Clinical quality is the real deal; this customer service stuff is the fluff stuff.”

“I am an excellent physician, highly trained and skilled at procedures; I can move patients; and my RVUs are among the highest in my group—why do I have to pay attention to this?”

“These patient-satisfaction surveys are poorly devised, do not measure quality, and are not statistically valid.”

What does the literature say about the connection between patients’ perceptions of care and clinical outcomes? In a study published in the Archives of Internal Medicine in 2012 titled “The Cost of Satisfaction,” the authors concluded, “In a nationally representative sample, higher patient satisfaction was associated with less emergency department use but with greater inpatient use, higher overall health-care and prescription drug expenditures, and increased mortality.”1 This article has been used by naysayers of patient satisfaction to suggest that the entire concept is misguided, and some quote a Forbes article based on that study published online in January 2013, “Why Rating Your Doctor Is Bad for Your Health.”2 The conclusion is that physicians are paying more attention to satisfying their patients than to treating them in an evidence-based manner and consequently their care costs more and they die more. This study, however, has serious methodological flaws: 1) They studied patient satisfaction only in the year 2000 (year 0) and never in the years when they studied cost and outcomes. 2) Prescription drug expenditures and hospital visits and admissions (cost) were studied only in 2001 (year 1) and never again, and mortality was studied in years 2001–2006 (years 1–6), during which years they never studied patient satisfaction or cost. Their conclusions have no legitimacy.

On the other hand, there are multiple articles in the literature that come to far different conclusions. In a review published in 2009, it was found that physician communication correlates strongly with patient adherence rates to treatment recommendations in acute and chronic disease.3 The authors noted that there were, at that time, more than 100 observational and 20-plus experimental studies published demonstrating the correlation of communication (patient satisfaction) with compliance. Compliance with treatment regimens has significant influence on quality measures in chronic disease and outcomes.4 In a review of the medical literature published in the British Medical Journal in 2013, patient experience was positively associated with clinical effectiveness and patient safety in 77.8 percent of studies, no association was found in 22 percent of studies, and a negative association was found in only one study (0.2 percent).5 Academic Medicine published a
In a review of the medical literature, patient experience was positively associated with clinical effectiveness and patient safety in 77.8 percent of studies, no association was found in 22 percent of studies, and a negative association was found in only one study.

Patient satisfaction, trust, and compliance, which lead to more desirable clinical outcomes,6 in another paper titled "Communication and Medication Refill Adherence," published in Archives of Internal Medicine in 2012, after adjusting for potential confounders, the prevalence of poor refill adherence increased by 0.9 percent (95 percent CI, 0.2–1.7 percent).11

In the interim, let’s also be clear that achieving great patient satisfaction is not rocket science. There are simple tactics that emergency physicians can implement, most of which take no more time than we currently spend, and that lead to an improved perception of care. Those tactics include: 1) introducing ourselves and our roles and acknowledging everyone in the room; 2) sitting down at the bedside; 3) using key words to communicate our caring; 4) always estimating for patients how long the ED visit will take and saying it will take longer than we believe it will take (we create expectations that we can then exceed); 5) ending the patient interaction with, “What questions do you have for me? Is there anything you would like for me to go over again?”; and 6) calling back patients who are discharged home within 48 hours to see how they are doing clinically and to ensure that they understood their home-care instructions and are following your recommendations.

Let us not bristle at the thought of the words, “patient satisfaction.” Most of us became physicians because we want to help people and we want to have purpose in our lives and do worthwhile work. If improved communication with patients leads to improved adherence to our recommendations for treatment, and therefore to improved clinical outcomes, we should be all for it.
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The entire issue of how the patient satisfaction surveys are then used is an entirely different matter. We do need to understand that our hospital administrators, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, and private insurers will continue to use the patient experience as a metric to measure quality, and they will then tie that value to payment, rewarding physicians and hospitals that do well and penalizing those that do not.

You can’t always see the chemicals in their eyes, but with the Morgan Lens you’ll know you’re getting them out.

Liquids, gases, fumes and other harmful chemicals are difficult to detect in the human eye. Fortunately the hands-free Morgan Lens removes them quickly and comfortably.

Discover why the BEST SOLUTION to pollution is dilution.
CMS and Maryland Enter into
ACCOUNTABLE CARE AGREEMENT

Maryland’s system, exempted from the Inpatient and Outpatient Prospective Payment Systems, shifts from fee-for-service to pay-for-performance model

BY WILLIAM JAQUIS, MD, FACEP

In 2014, Maryland made a dramatic move toward a population-based payment model. The change to a more globally based payment system is an attempt to move forward on the triple aim of improved health at a lower cost and with a better patient experience. Maryland’s unique all-payer system has recently been under increased scrutiny by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). This move may also help to preserve the system.

The all-payer system for hospital payments began in the early 1970s. The impetuses for its development were concerns not unique to Maryland: rapidly increasing Medicare and Medicaid costs and the disproportionate burden placed on hospitals in areas with a large number of patients without health insurance. The Maryland legislature took a different approach than other states with respect to its goals of controlling the growth in hospital costs, maintaining the viability of all hospitals that committed to quality care, and ensuring the fairness of reimbursement to hospitals. Out of this act, the Health Services Cost Review Commission (HSCRC) began in 1974. The HSCRC was given the authority to set hospital rates for all payers. Initially, this did not include Medicare and Medicaid, as federal law pre-empted state law. However, by 1977, Maryland was able to negotiate a waiver to include Medicare and Medicaid in its all-payer system. Hospitals may negotiate rates with the HSCRC to some degree, and the rates at a given hospital may vary from other hospitals based on factors such as the rate of self-pay patients. Once the HSCRC determines rates for hospitals for a given year, the reimbursement from the payers is the same across all payers, from Medicare to third-party payers.

The model has served Maryland, and presumptively CMS, well over the past 30-plus years. When the all-payer system started, the cost per admission for Medicare was 25 percent greater than the national average. In 2005, the cost per admission was 5 percent below the national average, continuing into 2007. Since then, however, the cost per admission has been increasing relative to the national average, and the waiver that allows Maryland to include Medicare and Medicaid in the all-payer system has been in jeopardy. Rather than lose the waiver, Maryland began negotiating with CMS. The negotiations led to the proposal and approval of a new payment system for hospitals. For the next five years, this model will be in place, and if Maryland is not successful in implementing this plan, it will transition to the national Medicare hospital-payment system.

As of January 2014, the payment model in Maryland began migrating from a traditional fee-for-service model to expenditures per capita for all payers. For the next five years, cost growth is capped at 3.58 percent for inpatient and outpatient care. For Medicare, Maryland will limit the growth to 0.5 percent less than the national growth rate per year. This is estimated to save Medicare $330 million in that five-year period. The base rate for individual hospitals is their total revenue from 2013, with a growth-rate ceiling of 3.58 percent. Hospitals can choose from two models of transition. The first is to transition to a global budget model from the beginning. The second involves a variable cost factor that reduces the incentive for hospitals to make money by increasing volume. If volume goes up, hospitals keep a fraction of the increase, but they also retain some of the lost revenue if volume goes down.

For Medicare, Maryland will limit the growth to 0.5 percent less than the national growth rate per year. This is estimated to save Medicare $330 million in that five-year period.

The goal of the change, besides the obvious cost savings, is to encourage hospitals to move to a population-based approach of providing care. Hospitals will move away from rewards for inpatient volume to a system that emphasizes prevention, quality, and more care coordination. Keeping patients out of the hospital and working with medical homes and community resources could lead to better outcomes and a healthier population. If successful, this could lead to control of the total cost of health care for Maryland.

DR. JAQUIS is system chief of emergency medicine at LifeBridge Health and chief of emergency medicine and attending physician at Sinai Hospital, both in Baltimore. He is a member of the ACEP Board of Directors.
Cric 2.0 Part Deux
Making the incision and inserting the tube

The importance of verifying the cricothyroid membrane cannot be overstated. At this location, the incision has protected boundaries created by what I call the “cartilaginous cage.”

Article and Photography by RICHARD M. LEVITAN, MD, FACEP

Part two of a two-part series.

Part one of this article (February ACEP Now, p. 26) addressed the “laryngeal handshake,” a means of reliably finding the external landmarks for performing a cricothyrotomy. We left off with the nondominant hand stabilizing the larynx, and the dominant hand resting on the sternum. “Sternal stabilization” is fundamental for good control of the scalpel. By firmly pushing your dominant hand against the patient’s sternum, your hand is not hovering in space over the neck. It also helps tremendously when your elevated heart rate would otherwise impede fine motor control. The blade needs to be controlled two ways: first, for the midline vertical incision through the skin and, second, rotating the blade for the horizontal incision through the cricothyroid membrane.

Breaking down the sequential steps:
1) Laryngeal handshake, nondominant hand on larynx (see Figure 1)
2) Sternal stabilization (dominant hand on sternum)
3) Vertical skin incision
4) Palpation of the cricothyroid membrane with the nondominant index finger
5) Horizontal incision through the membrane
6) Flip the blade (extending the incision) in the other direction

Although single stab incisions through the skin and membrane are feasible in thin individuals, a vertical skin incision is best. A skin incision permits direct palpation of the cartilages and cricothyroid membrane, confirming the correct location before making the horizontal incision into the airway (see Figure 2). In the super obese, larger vertical incisions are required to enable the horizontal incision.

The importance of verifying the cricothyroid membrane cannot be overstated. At this location, the incision has protected boundaries created by what I call the “cartilaginous cage” (see Figures 3 and 4). This is a “safe space” delineated by cartilage: above is the inferior aspect of the thyroid lamina; below is the anterior cricoid ring; laterally are the inferior cornu of the thyroid (on either side); and, perhaps most important, there is a firm backstop, the high back wall of the cricoid cartilage (see Figure 5). If the incision is made too high (between the hyoid and thyroidea), it will be above the vocal cords. If made too low (below the cricoid) you enter the trachea. At the trachea, there is nothing stopping the blade from going too far laterally (i.e., cutting great vessels) and also nothing to prevent puncturing the posterior membranous trachea (entering the esophagus and mediastinum).

A tracheal hook has a sharp point to puncture the membrane and lift up on the inferior thyroid, stabilizing the trachea while the incision is performed. Whether or not a hook is used, when using a #11 blade, it’s necessary to widen the incision by extending the cut in the other direction after the blade enters the trachea. A #10 blade, because it has a larger width, may not require this. If a hook is not used to control the trachea, something should go immediately...

CONTINUED on page 23

Figure 1. The “laryngeal handshake,” from left to right: 1) hyoid, 2) thyroid, 3) cricoid, and 4) palpation of cricothyroid membrane.

Figure 2. Making the initial vertical skin incision.

Figure 3. Palpating the cricothyroid membrane.
Student Loans: Get Them Forgiven or Pay Them Off?

by JAMES M. DAHALE, MD, FACEP

**Question:** I have heard that there are debt-consolidation and loan-forgiveness programs that might be useful to me. How should I manage my student loans?

**Answer:** Many established attending emergency physicians are unaware of the incredible size of the student loan burden faced by more recent graduates. According to the Association of American Medical Colleges, in 2012, the average student loan debt among indebted medical school graduates was about $167,000 for MD students. Debt levels are even higher for DO students. These numbers, of course, are mere averages. Twenty-five percent of 2012 graduates owe more than $200,000, and 5 percent owe more than $300,000. I’m confident these sums have not gone down since 2012. Student loan interest rates for those in residency now are no lower than 6.8 percent and sometimes as high as 11 to 15 percent for private loans. At an average interest rate of 8 percent, a student with $300,000 of debt at medical school graduation may owe as much as $378,000 upon completion of residency. Required payments on this debt may be more than $3,600 per month, much more than the typical American, and many a physician, spends on a mortgage. Many of these young physicians also have substantial consumer debt from automobile loans or credit cards. Emergency physicians, however, should count their blessings. Some attending physicians practicing in lower-paying specialties after attending expensive medical schools are now being turned down for student loan refinancing due to their income-to-debt ratio being too high! No wonder young doctors are looking for some relief from this financial pressure.

The Income-Based Repayment (IBR) Plan

Without IBR, most residents would be either bankrupt or forced into forbearance or hardship deferrals. IBR bases student loan payments on income rather than total debt or interest rate. As a result, residents making IBR payments on unsubsidized loans are often paying much less than even the interest on their loans. The IBR plan was recently changed; it is technically a modification of an older loan program called Income-Contingent Repayment, or ICR-A, and is also called “Pay as You Earn.” It caps student loan payments at 10 percent of “discretionary income” instead of the previous 15 percent under IBR. Discretionary income is defined as the difference between adjusted gross income (line 38 on IRS Form 1040) and 150 percent of the federal poverty level, about $8,000 for a single physician and about $36,000 for a family of four. So if you’re a resident making $50,000, your payments are capped at $267 per month if you are single and $117 per month if you are married with two kids. Since the interest alone on a $300,000 8 percent loan is $2,000 per month, you can see that the IBR/ICR-A payments are just a drop in the bucket, and the debt will continue to grow while in the program. When a resident graduates and begins earning a higher income, IBR/ICR-A payments will revert to a higher amount, calculated using the original debt on a 10-year repayment basis. If payments are made every month for 20 years, the remainder of the debt will then be forgiven. However, the typical emergency physician making even the minimum payments will have the debt paid off by then, so IBR forgiveness is really not a factor for most doctors.

The Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) Program

PSLF is a type of loan forgiveness that can be beneficial for doctors. If a doctor works for a qualifying 501(c)(3) employer, such as the military, Department of Veterans Affairs, a university hospital, or a non-profit hospital, the remainder of the loan forgiveness can be received after 10 years of qualifying payments instead of 20. This is a particularly beneficial program for specialists with long training programs, such as medical, pediatric, and surgical subspecialists. However, even emergency physicians, with their relatively short residency, can gain substantial benefits from PSLF. Eventually, you are forgiven the amount by which you underpaid your loans in residency, plus the interest that accumulated because of those underpayments.

Consider again the physician with $300,000 of debt at 8 percent. On a straightforward 10-year repayment plan, the payments would be $3,616 per month. Since three of those seven years were spent on an IBR plan paying $117 per month, then the underpayment is ($3,616 – $117) x 36, or nearly $126,000. However, due to accumulated interest, the amount forgiven after 10 years will be even more, about $352,000. The physician who owed $300,000 upon medical school graduation will end up paying about $338,000 and receiving another $252,000 in loan forgiveness. The more years spent in training and the higher the interest rate, the higher the debt burden and the more that stands to be forgiven. Forgiveness obtained through PSLF, unlike IBR forgiveness, is tax-free.

A few caveats: First, notice how the emergency physician in the example still ended up paying more than the original debt. It does not make any sense to run up extra debt thinking it will all be forgiven. You will end up paying a large portion of it, especially after a short residency. Second, many emergency physicians who work in 501(c)3 hospitals are not actually employed by the hospital. They may be an employee or a partner of a small democratic group or a large contract-management group that contracts with the...
hospital. These doctors are not eli-
gible for PSLF. Third, I would not be surprised to see the benefits of this program disappear or become means-tested once the press finds out that “rich doctors are having hundreds of thousands of dollars forgiven at the taxpayers’ expense.”

### Decision Time

Nearly every resident will need to make IBR/ICR payments in residency. They simply cannot afford the regular payments. However, at residency graduation, physicians need to make a decision. If they will be working for a 501(c)(3), they should probably go for PSLF, continuing to make minimum payments for another seven years. If they will be working for a private employer, then it is time to get busy paying off those loans just as fast as they can. Continuing a lifestyle similar to the one they had as a resident is the key to freeing them-selves from this substantial financial burden within two to five years.

#### Loan Consolidation Versus Loan Refinancing

The federal government has offered loan-consolidation programs for years. However, they were nearly useless because they simply turned all a borrower’s loans into a single loan at the average interest rate of the consolidated loans. While convenient, this did not actually save the physician borrower any money.

A better option for doctors not go-
ing for PSLF is loan refinancing with a private bank or other lender, although they do have to qualify based on their income-to-debt ra-
tio and credit score. Refinancing can currently be done at rates as low as 5 percent fixed and 3 percent vari-
able, but there are very few lenders currently offering these refinanc-
ing loans. Refinanced loans are not eligible for PSLF, may be assessed against the estate should the bor-
rower die before paying them off, and, like other student loans, are generally not forgivable in bank-
ruptcy. Doctors with some home equity have an even better option: converting student loans into mort-
gage loans by using a home-equity loan or other refinancing technique. Student loans are inferior to mort-
gage loans in many ways. They are generally nondeductible, usually nonforgivable, and are often high interest, at least for loans taken out in the last eight to 10 years. A physi-
cian with fully deductible mortgage interest might be able to turn an 8 percent student loan into an after-
tax 2 percent loan.

### Student Loans Versus Investing

Another dilemma attending physi-
cians face is deciding when to use extra money to invest, particularly in tax-advantaged retirement ac-
counts, and when to use that money to pay down student loan debt. The following guidelines published in chapter six of The White Coat Inves-
tor: A Doctor’s Guide to Personal Fi-
nance and Investing may be helpful:

1. Get the match. Employer pro-
vided retirement plan matching funds are really part of your salary. Don’t leave the match on the table by not contributing.

2. Pay off any high-interest debt (greater than 8 percent), such as credit cards, car loans, ex-

ensive private student loans, etc. This is a fantastic guaran-
teed investment return.

3. Maximize your tax-deferred re-
tirement plan contributions, in-
cluding 401(k)s, profit-sharing plans, 403(b)s, 457s, and defined benefit/cash balance plans.

4. Fund a Health Savings Account (HSA) if eligible (see my Janu-
ary 2016 ACEP Now column for details).

The following four items can be reordered, according to your finan-
cial priorities.

### Many established attending emergency physicians are unaware of the incredible size of the student loan burden faced by more recent graduates.

- 5. Fund a personal and spousal Backdoor Roth IRA (see http://
  whitecoatinvestor.com/back-
  door-roth-ira-tutorial/ for more on
  this technique to be covered in a future column).

- 6. Fund a college savings plan (529) for each child up to the
  amount that your state subsi-
dizes with tax breaks.

- 7. Pay off moderate-interest debt (4 to 8 percent), such as student
  loans (unless you anticipate forgiveness).

- 8. Save for a house down payment (if not using a physician loan).

The next four items can be reor-
dered, according to your financial priorities and comfort level with debt.

- 9. If you used a physician mort-
gage, pay it down to enable refinancing into a lower-rate
  conventional mortgage.

- 10. Add additional funding if desired to college savings (529)
accounts.

- 11. Invest in a taxable account in
  risky investments (stock index
  funds, real estate, etc.).

- 12. Pay off low-interest (1 to 3
  percent) student loan debt (unless you anticipate for-
giveness).

The final three items can also be reordered according to your pri-
orities.


- 14. Invest in a taxable account in
  low-risk investments (municip-
  al bond funds, etc.).

- 15. Spend your money on what
  makes you happy.

Managing your student loans wisely will set you up for financial success during your career and re-
tirement.

---

**Figure 4.** The “cartilaginous cage” (arrow) on a papier-mâché model of the laryngeal cartilages. Produced by Dr. Louis Auzoux, Paris, France, circa 1850. Collection of Richard M. Levitan, MD.

**Figure 5.** Auzoux laryngeal model showing, top to bottom, the hyoid, thyroid, and cricoid separated. The cricoid incision is aimed at the high back wall of the cricoid cartilage (arrow).

**Figure 6.** Inserting a Shiley. Initial tip insertion is made 90 degrees to the tracheal axis, and then after the tip has passed, the device is rotated in the direction of the tracheal axis on full insertion.

---

The surgical airway is one of the most intimidating procedures for emergency physicians. The “laryngeal handshakes,” “ternal sternalization,” and appreciating the “cartilaginous cage” can make you perform like a hero in the crisis moment when your patient needs a cric.
Predicting TIMI’s Mortality

It is time for this risk score to leave the ED

by RYAN PATRICK RADECKI, MD, MS

Can you recite the elements of the TIMI Score—the Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction Risk Score for Unstable Angina/Non-ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction—from memory? If you still can, it’s not surprising. Over the last decade, this score has been drilled, dogmatically, into many specialties, including emergency medicine. Numerous studies have utilized it, attempting to define a low-risk cohort from unselected chest pain patients presenting to the emergency department. Fortunately for EM, but unfortunately for the brain cells sacrificially dedicated to its memory, the next wave of decision instruments promises to eliminate it from use.

The original TIMI Score is not derived from an emergency department cohort. These were patients admitted and anticoagulated for concerning chest pain in the setting of ECG changes, known coronary artery disease, or positive biomarkers. The original predictive value of the TIMI Score was intended to prognosticate 14-day mortality or new cardiac ischemia for cardiac inpatients, not emergency department presentations. The generalizability of this cohort to our setting is simply lacking, and the logistic regression identifies elements—aspirin use within seven days—that may add specificity for poor outcomes in an intermediate-to-high-risk cohort but fails in providing utility for describing a minimal-risk cohort.

As expected, the largest meta-analysis of prospective studies using TIMI in the emergency department demonstrated even requiring a TIMI of 0 for discharge is only 97.2 percent (95 percent CI, 96.4–97.8) sensitive for cardiac events. This strategy would result in 78 percent of patients being admitted for cardiac evaluation and still result in adverse outcomes for one in 50 discharged patients. Pursuing this strategy is clearly foolish.

Fortunately, science marches on. From the Netherlands, the HEART (History, ECG, Age, Risk Factors, Troponin) Score was derived and designed for use in the emergency department. Reflecting several elements common to clinician gestalt, HEART demonstrates substantially improved performance over TIMI. When used as recommended by the authors, a HEART Score of 0 to 1 reflects a six-week event-free prognosis with a miss rate ranging between 0.6 percent and 1.8 percent in validation studies. At the same time, the number of patients classified as low risk increases up to a third of the presenting cohort—an improvement that, by itself, ought to retire TIMI to its intended place on the inpatient side.

The next step in ED-centric decision-instrument development may come from New Zealand and Australia, with the Emergency Department Assessment of Chest Pain Score (EDACS): This score incorporates many of the same elements seen in the HEART Score but at a more detailed and granular level. Rather than each of the five elements being awarded up to two points, the EDACS breaks age, coronary disease, and signs and symptoms into myriad additive and subtractive elements. The advantage of this is greater specificity. In the original derivation and validation cohort, it was used in conjunction with zero-hour and two-hour troponin measurements to classify nearly 50 percent of the cohort as low risk, with a sensitivity greater than 99 percent. The downside: get out your calculator. While not nearly as bad as the GRACE (Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events) Score, this decision instrument approaches the complexity limit for clinical acceptability. Increasing availability of computerized decision support potentially decreases the resultant cognitive strain, but this remains a limitation. Prospective validation of the EDACS-Accelerated Diagnostic Protocol is under way in Europe and North America.

Most important, however, the development of these ED-centric decision instruments and disposition pathways, along with the North American Chest Pain Rule, indicate emergency medicine has moved beyond the hand-me-downs from our cardiology brethren. Not only is it time for TIMI to be retired, it’s likely time to reconsider the relevance of the other American Heart Association recommendations for the evaluation of acute non-specific chest pain in the emergency department. Universal recommendations for early provocative or anatomic testing are discordant with the reality of our resource-limited settings, and a recognition of the harms of false positives further informs the need for practice evolution. ACEP should support emergency physicians utilizing these prospectively derived risk-stratification tools for early disposition of patients from the emergency department, specifically to address the medical legal fallout from moving to a rational, but not “zero miss,” strategy. We’ve gone too far down the rabbit hole, but there may yet be light at the end of the tunnel.
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Twitter Newcomers, Toxicology Tips, Game-Changing Research, and ARDS Advice

by JEREMY SAMUEL FAUST, MD, MS, MA

Not addicted to Twitter yet? Not a problem. Here are five recent tweets that’ll give you a sense of what is going on in the emergency medicine Twittersphere.

1

The emergency medicine Twittersphere has an egalitarian feel, and people from all levels of training and experience frequently make valuable contributions and interact as a community. When a big name joins the conversation, it brews real excitement. So, when Indiana University pulmonary embolism guru Jeffrey Kline, MD, began tweeting in February, his presence was immediately noticed and appreciated. Dr. Kline has only tweeted a few dozen times, but each tweet has packed a punch. “Causes of a false negative #D-dimer: symptoms greater than 72h, distal clots, lipemia with turbidimetric assays and blocking proteins” and “Clinician gestalt is as good as a validated computerized method for estimating PE probability; not so for ACS. Ann Emerg Med 2014 63:275-80” are just two representative tweets from this evidence-based medicine luminary. Welcome to Twitter, Dr. Kline (@KlineLab).

2

Leon Gussow, MD (@poisonreview), a professor at the University of Illinois, frequently tweets links to his blog, which zeroes in on relevant and topical toxicology cases that have appeared in peer-reviewed journals. He reviews these papers with expertise that few can rival. His recent post, “Central pontine myelinolysis associated with ethylene glycol intoxication” is a review of an article from the Journal of Emergency Medicine (2014;46:369-374). One great pearl from Gussow’s review: osmotic demyelination syndrome (the new proposed name for central pontine myelinolysis) resulting from hyperosmolar insults such as ethylene glycol and other toxic alcohols has similar neurological sequelae as some of the other more “classic” causes. However, in some of the toxin-related cases, there are reports of possible associations with better outcomes, which may be helpful in keeping some hope alive for favorable prognoses in such challenging cases.

3

A relatively new FOAM resource is REBEL EM by Salim Rezaie, MD, FACEP (@srezaie), assistant program director and clinical assistant professor of emergency medicine and internal medicine at the University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio. Dr. Rezaie’s site is a growing resource for EM board review and other general EM topics. Sal also wins the award for best new acronym with his eponymous Rezaie’s Evidence Based Evaluation article on Dr. Rezaie’s site cowritten by some bright minds in EM, each of whom suggested articles that were “Game Changers in EM” (http://site.to/1my8tBox). The article contains four short but remarkably in-depth and thoughtful reviews of four major articles of the past decade: the ADAPT trial on discharging patients with low-risk chest pain; Perry et al. on the sensitivity of CT for subarachnoid hemorrhage within six hours of headache onset; the 2012 Cochrane review on antiemetics for pediatric acute gastrointestinal; and the recent landmark addition to therapeutic hypothermia literature, Nielson’s study comparing 33°C versus 36°C as target temperatures for post-cardiac arrest care. It’s always nice to have a slew of great papers discussed at such a high level in one easy-to-read article.

4

Flight paramedic (and pre-med) Derek Sifford’s (@flightmed1) post “BMJ: Statistical adulation and samples or you want to know just what exactly the t-test, chi squared, or an exact probability test is, you’ll find the explanations and simplified equations in this one free resource. On a side note, admissions directors shouldn’t need a personal statement from Dr. Sifford: just read his Twitter feed!

5

Finally, “Eoapist for nitric oxide for ARDS” is a post from the anonymous account @EgeronYTdavidIV (although this homage account to the fictitious alter ego of the legendary Dr. William Osler seems to be associated with the Life in the Fastlane blog, the standard bearer for EM blogs Down Under and the world over). The tweet links to a great article in the PulmCCM.org blog, created by Matthew Hoffman, MD. The author analyzes a new review in the journal Critical Care Medicine (2016;42:404-412), “Inhaled nitric oxide does not reduce mortality in patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome regardless of severity: systematic review and meta-analysis.” The meta-analysis aggregates data from 1762 patients with acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS) and comes to some harrowing conclusions. Just as devastating as the authors’ conclusion that nitric oxide has no mortality benefit for patients with ARDS regardless of how poorly the patients’ lungs were performing at the time of administration is the association between nitric oxide and the development of renal impairment. Taken together with the cost and hassle of nitric oxide administration, this article (and its recirculation in the FOAM world) may finally put an end to the most comprehensive free stats tutorial/review I have found! http://bit.ly/obGCbc #FOAMed #EMed is a real find. Whether you need a review on the difference between populations and samples or you want to know just exactly what exactly the t-test, chi squared, or an exact probability test is, you’ll find the explanations and simplified equations in this one free resource.

DO YOU HAVE ANY FAVORITE TWEETS THAT ACEP NOW READERS SHOULD KNOW ABOUT VIA THE FEED?

TWEET AT ME @JEREMYFAUST OR EMAIL TO JSFAUST@GMAIL.COM.
TRICKS OF THE TRADE

Why choose when you can have both?

by HOWARD “HOWIE” MELL, MD, MPH, CPE, FACEP

My 8-year-old daughter recently had a tonsillectomy at Rainbow Babies & Children’s Hospital in Cleveland. The perioperative nurse came to her before she was wheeled back to the operating room and asked, “What flavor do you like? Cherry, blueberry, or watermelon?” When my daughter picked cherry, the nurse pulled a tube of lip balm from her pocket, and together, they coated the inside of a pediatric non-rebreather mask and anesthesia bag mask with it. The nurse explained that this way it would “smell good while (she) went to sleep.” My daughter loved it.

There is a body of research that suggests sweet or pleasant odors may improve pain tolerance.1-3 Perhaps as a result, some pediatric anesthesia teams use flavored lip balms (e.g., cherry ChapStick) to coat the inside of masks that are used to provide anesthesia or to provide oxygen in support of procedural sedation. This seems to improve patient tolerance and reduce anxiety. Offering patients their pick of flavors may also increase their comfort by allowing them a small item of choice during a time when they feel events are beyond their control. Given the increasing use of the intranasal route of medication administration in emergency medicine (e.g., intranasal fentanyl 1-2 mcg/kg for pain control or intranasal midazolam 0.6 mcg/kg for procedural sedation) and the increasing use of emergency department procedural sedation in children often via ketamine (1 mg/kg IV, 4-5 mcg/kg IM), whose dissociative effects may be aided by inclusion of pleasant sensations such as sweet smells, emergency physicians should include flavored lip balm in their practice. Consider offering lip balm to any patients who will receive intranasal medications or undergo procedural sedation (especially if using ketamine) or as a distraction and calming technique for children. Ideally, have more than one flavor to offer, as children are easier to calm if they are offered choices that make them participants in their care. Take the lip balm and liberally spread it over the inside surface of a non-rebreather mask. School children can be guided to do this themselves (and they often enjoy decorating the outside of the mask with stickers if you have any available). Allow patients to inhale from the coated mask prior to and immediately following the use of intranasal medications or during initiation and recovery from procedural sedation. Anecdotally, patients and their families are very appreciative of this small comfort we can provide.

If you choose to use this technique, be aware that several health care organizations have erroneously interpreted the National Fire Protection Association’s (NFPA) 1996 edition of the Standard for Health Care Facilities to mean that any petroleum-based product presents a fire hazard in the presence of 100 percent oxygen. Fortunately, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) did laboratory testing on this very question in the 1960s. Its report, published by the Civil Aeromedicine Research Institute, found that “a large margin of safety exists in using hydrocarbon face and hair preparations in the presence of 100 percent oxygen. Rep 62-27. Rep Civ Aeromed Res Inst US. 1963;Nov:1-5.”

Some pediatric anesthesia teams use flavored lip balms to coat the inside of masks used to provide anesthesia or oxygen in support of procedural sedation.
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EM Residency Program Director
Cleveland, Ohio

4M Emergency Systems has an excellent opportunity for a BC Osteopathic Emergency Medicine Practitioner to join the UH Regional Hospital EM Residency Program, as the Program Director. Candidates are expected to demonstrate aptitude with both clinical leadership and medical education leadership experiences. Prior administrative experience in Emergency Medicine residency leadership roles is required. Candidates must have completed an accredited osteopathic emergency medicine training program and must be ABOEM board certified.

4M Emergency Systems offers extremely competitive compensation and benefit package including:

- $40,000.00 Sign on Bonus
- Incentive plan
- Fully paid family health, dental and vision plan
- 401K plan with 6% company match
- Malpractice
- Paid Life & long/short-term disability
- HSA Contribution

To learn more about joining our practice, please contact Erin Waggoner or Jeff Mirelli at (888) 758-3999 or via email at EWaggoner@4Mdocs.com or jmirelli@4mdocs.com

EMERGENCY MEDICINE PHYSICIANS

Greenville Health System (GHS), the largest healthcare provider in South Carolina, seeks BC/BE Physicians to staff its academic Level 1 Trauma Center and 3 community hospital EDs in the newly established Department of Emergency Medicine. Grow with us as core or clinical faculty as the department incorporates an Emergency Medicine residency program in the near future.

Emergency services include the following:

- The only Level 1 Trauma Center in Greenville
- The Upstate’s only Pediatric Emergency Department, Children’s Hospital and PICU to treat the most severe injuries and illnesses in children
- Greenville’s most advanced Chest Pain Center to provide special care and observation

GHS employs over 11,000 people, including 700 physicians. Our system includes clinically excellent facilities with 1,358 beds on 6 campuses. We offer 14 residency and fellowship programs and are home to one of the nation’s newest allopathic medical schools - University of South Carolina School of Medicine – Greenville. Faculty appointments are commensurate with experience.

Greenville, South Carolina is a beautiful place to live and work and the GHS catchment area is 1.3 million people. Greenville is located on the I-85 corridor between Atlanta and Charlotte, and is one of the fastest growing areas in the country. We are ideally situated near beautiful mountains, beaches and lakes.

We offer great compensation and benefit plans, malpractice insurance and full relocation packages. Qualified candidates should submit a letter of interest and CV to: Kendra Hall, Sr. Physician Recruiter, khall@ghs.org.

ph: 800-772-6987
GHS does not offer sponsorship at this time.
EOE

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

Georgia Emergency Physician
Athens, GA

The University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, is seeking a full-time Emergency Medicine Physician to join our growing on-call service. The University of Georgia is a land grant, sea grant, and space grant public research university with a student body of over 35,000. Our Emergency Medicine group enjoys a fun and collegial work environment. We offer a competitive compensation and benefits package including:

- Competitive salary
- Incentive plan
- 401K with 6% company match
- Malpractice
- Paid Life & long-term disability
- HSA

To learn more about joining our practice, please contact Dr. Julie Schilling at jschiling@uga.edu.

EOE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

Clinical Assistant Professor, Emergency Medicine
Tucson, AZ

The University of Arizona College of Medicine – Tucson, Department of Emergency Medicine, is seeking a full-time, non-tenure track physician to join our emergency medicine residency program. The ideal candidate will participate in the residency program and serve as a University of Arizona College of Medicine–Tucson affiliated clinical educator.

The Emergency Medicine Resident Program includes approximately 100 beds at a 22-hour level I trauma center, which handles approximately 100,000 visits annually. There are 24-hour inpatient consults, and faculty are responsible for inpatient care. The University of Arizona Campus Physician Practice offers an excellent work environment.

The University of Arizona is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. We strongly encourage applications from women, minorities, and individuals with disabilities. For additional information, please visit our website at http://emergency.arizona.edu

EOE

The University of California, San Francisco

Chief of Pediatric Emergency Medicine
San Francisco, CA

The Department of Emergency Medicine at the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF), School of Medicine, seeks an outstanding leader in Pediatric Emergency Medicine (PEM) to serve as Chief of the Division of Pediatric Emergency Medicine. The Division Chief will direct the vision and manage the growth of pediatric emergency care at several UCSF campuses including San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH), Parnassus Heights (the current location of UCSF Benioff Children’s Hospital), and Mission Bay, the site of the new children’s hospital ED opening in 2015. In addition, UCSF’s affiliation with Children’s Hospital and Research Center Oakland will bring further opportunities for clinical, educational, and academic collaboration. The Chief will mentor the PEM faculty and be a pioneering leader as PEM expands at this premier institution. The Chief will be responsible for the Division’s budget, faculty recruitment and evaluation.

The UCSF Department of Emergency Medicine provides comprehensive emergency services to a large local and referral population with approximately 93,000 visits a year at UCSF Medical Center and San Francisco General Hospital. The new UCSF Benioff Children’s Hospital Emergency Department will open in February 2015. SFGH, a level-1 trauma center, paramedic base station and training center, is opening a new hospital in 2015, with a 60-bed emergency department, including a new 8-bed pediatric ED. The Chief will have the opportunity to work with outstanding EM and pediatric residents at all sites. The Department of Emergency Medicine has a fully-accredited 4-year Emergency Medicine Residency Program with 48 residents and directs several fellowship programs. The pediatric training program has 87 residents and 15 fellowships. Research is a major priority, with over 50 ongoing studies and 100 peer-reviewed publications in the Department of Emergency Medicine last year. There are opportunities for leadership and growth within the Department and UCSF School of Medicine.

Applicants for this position must have a minimum of 5 years leadership experience in an academic emergency department and must be Board Certified in Pediatric Emergency Medicine.

The University of California, San Francisco, is one of the nation’s top five medical schools and demonstrates excellence in basic science and clinical research, global health sciences, policy, advocacy, and medical education scholarship. The San Francisco Bay Area is well-known for its great food, mild climate, beautiful scenery, vibrant cultural environment, and its outdoor recreational activities.

Send cover letter and curriculum vitae to:
Ellen Weber, MD, Vice Chair
c/o Natalya Khait
UCSF Department of Emergency Medicine
533 Parnassus Avenue, Suite US755
San Francisco, CA 94143-0749
Natalya.khait@emergency.ucsf.edu

UCSF seeks candidates whose experience, teaching, research, or community service has prepared them to contribute to our commitment to diversity and excellence. UCSF is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. The University undertakes affirmative action to assure equal employment opportunity for underutilized minorities and women, for persons with disabilities, and for covered veterans. All qualified applicants are encouraged to apply, including minorities and women. For additional information, please visit our website at http://emergency.ucsf.edu
Department of Emergency Medicine
Residency Program
Director
University of California, San Francisco

The Department of Emergency Medicine at the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF), seeks outstanding candidates for the position of Residency Program Director. The residency program is a fully-accredited four-year program with 48 residents and plans to expand in the near future. Residents are exposed to a diverse patient population with a combined total of approximately 93,000 patient visits each year at their primary sites. Residents rotate at UCSF Medical Center, San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center, San Francisco VA Medical Center, Children’s Hospital & Research Center Oakland, and Kaiser Permanente San Francisco Hospital. In 2015, the new UCSF Benioff Children’s Hospital will open in Mission Bay, and a new hospital will open at San Francisco General Hospital, each with a dedicated pediatric ED.

The Department of Emergency Medicine serves as the primary teaching site for the residency program, providing comprehensive emergency services to a large local and referral population at both UCSF Medical Center and San Francisco General Hospital. The UCSF Medical Center is ranked among the nation’s 10 best hospitals by U.S. News & World Report. SFGH is a level-1 trauma center, paramedic base station and training center. Research is a major priority of the department, with over 50 ongoing studies and 100 peer-reviewed publications in the past year. There are opportunities for leadership and growth within the Department and UCSF School of Medicine.

Applicants for this position must have a minimum of five years educational leadership experience, three years experience as a core faculty member at an ACGME-approved Emergency Medicine Residency Program, and be board certified by the American Board of Emergency Medicine. Candidates must have strong interpersonal skills and be able to work cooperatively and congenially with a diverse academic and clinical environment. Candidates with leadership skills and a vision for enhancing the educational and academic missions of the department are especially encouraged to apply. Appointment level and rank will be commensurate with experience and qualifications.

Opportunities exist for expanded leadership roles in the department for qualified candidates.

The University of California, San Francisco, is one of the nation’s top five medical schools and demonstrates excellence in basic science and clinical research, global health sciences, policy, advocacy, and medical education scholarship. The San Francisco Bay Area is well-known for its great food, mild climate, beautiful scenery, vibrant cultural environment, and its outdoor recreational activities.

Send cover letter and curriculum vitae to:
Ellen Weber, MD, Vice Chair
c/o Natalya Khait
UCSF Department of Emergency Medicine
533 Parnassus Avenue, Suite U575
San Francisco, CA, 94143-0749
Natalya.khait@emergency.ucsf.edu

UCSF seeks candidates whose experience, teaching, research, or community service has prepared them to contribute to our commitment to diversity and excellence. UCSF is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. The University undertakes affirmative action to assure equal employment opportunity for underutilized minorities and women, persons with disabilities, and for covered veterans. All qualified applicants are encouraged to apply, including minorities and women. For additional information, please visit our website at http://emergency.ucsf.edu/.
The University of California San Francisco, Department of Emergency Medicine is recruiting for faculty beginning with the 2014-15 academic year. We have a particular interest in 1) individuals fellowship-trained in pediatric emergency medicine and 2) individuals who have a track record of successful research activities, as demonstrated by peer-review publications and funding. Rank and series will be commensurate with qualifications.

The Department of Emergency Medicine provides comprehensive emergency services to a large local and referral population with approximately 93,000 visits a year at UCSF Medical Center and San Francisco General Hospital. The new UCSF Benioff Children’s Hospital Emergency Department will open in February 2015. SFGH, a level 1 trauma center, paramedic base station and training center, is opening a new hospital in 2015, with a 60-bed emergency department, including an 8-bed pediatric ED. The Department of Emergency Medicine serves as the primary teaching site for a fully accredited 4-year Emergency Medicine residency program which currently has 48 residents and directs several fellowships. Research is a major priority, with over 68 ongoing studies and 102 peer-review publications in the past year. There are opportunities for leadership and growth within the Department and UCSF School of Medicine.

We are looking for outstanding pediatric emergency physicians with board certification in Emergency Medicine or Pediatric Emergency Medicine. For the research position, board certification in emergency medicine is required and the successful candidate will demonstrate outstanding and original research, a track record of funding, and a collaborative spirit. We will also consider emergency medicine faculty with outstanding and original contributions in education and training, and/or noteworthy innovation in clinical practice.

The University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) is one of the nation’s top five medical schools, and demonstrates excellence in basic science and clinical research, global health sciences, policy, advocacy, and medical education scholarship. The San Francisco Bay Area is well-known for its great food, mild climate, beautiful scenery, vibrant cultural environment and its outdoor recreational activities.

Send cover letter and curriculum vitae to:
Ellen Weber, MD, Vice Chair
c/o Natalya Khait
UCSF Department of Emergency Medicine
533 Parnassus Avenue, Suite U575
San Francisco, CA. 94143 – 0749
Natalya.khait@emergency.ucsf.edu

UCSF seeks candidates whose experience, teaching, research, or community service has prepared them to contribute to our commitment to diversity and excellence. UCSF is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. The University undertakes affirmative action to assure equal employment opportunity for underutilized minorities and women, for persons with disabilities, and for covered veterans. All qualified applicants are encouraged to apply, including minorities and women. For additional information, please visit our website at http://emergency.ucsf.edu/
OHIO - Columbus
MEDICAL DIRECTOR
Medical Director opportunity in desirable suburban Columbus location. This 21,000 volume ED has 9-hour physician shifts plus MLP support. Premier Physician Services is seeking an ABEM/AOBEM physician with solid leadership abilities; sharing our commitment first to quality patient care and excellence. In return we offer superb financial and professional opportunity with the opportunity to participate fully in the decisions and financial rewards of the practice. You’ll enjoy the benefits of an outstanding model offering equity-ownership at one year with no buy-in; an excellent package with director stipend and sign-on bonus; and very appealing benefits including family medical plan, employer-funded pension, malpractice, expense account, incentive & additional benefits.
Contact: Amy Spegal
Phone: (800)726-3627, ext 3682
Email: aspegal@premierdocs.com
Fax: (937)312-3683.

OHIO - Dayton
BP/BIC EM physician sought to join solidly established, democratic group at 42,000 volume ED in northern suburb. Enjoy working in a collegial environment and outstanding physical plant. Excellent package includes guaranteed hourly plus incentive, malpractice, employer-funded pension, family medical plan, CME, and more.
Contact Greg Felder, Premier Physician Services, (800) 726-3627, ext 3670
E-mail: gfelder@premierdocs.com
Fax: (937)312-3671.

North Carolina
Matthews, (Suburban Charlotte)
FT or PT BC/BE EM Physician opportunity with Mid-Atlantic Emergency Medical Associates, (MEMA), an independent, physician owned, democratic group.
Community practice, no academic affiliations provides comprehensive benefits, flexible scheduling. Enjoy working in a beautiful suburb with 32 bed ED, with 50,000 visits annually, is one of 3 hospitals we staff in the Charlotte area. Moderate climate with easy access to international airport, mountains, beaches, great neighborhoods, good schools, unlimited recreational opportunities.
Contact Mary Lu Leatherman, Physician Recruiter, Mid-Atlantic Emergency Medical Associates (MEMA), 704-377-2424
mleatherman@memma.net, www.memma.net

ACEP Now Classified Advertising
ACEP Now has the largest circulation among emergency medicine specialty print publications with nearly 40,000 BPA-Audited subscribers including about 32,000 ACEP members.
Your ad will also reach the entire 1,800 members of the Society of Emergency Medicine Physician Assistants (SEMPA).
To place an ad in ACEP Now's Classified Advertising section please contact:
Kevin Dunn: kdunn@cunnasso.com or
Cynthia Kucera: ckucera@cunnasso.com
Phone: 201-767-4170
EM Physician
Live Where You Choose
Superior Compensation & Equity
Ownership
Premier Physician Services has a very appealing opportunity for an ABEM or AOBEM internal traveler. Enjoy the flexibility of locums without sacrificing advantages of shareholder status and outstanding benefits. Limited clinical hours and enhanced compensation negate travel time.
Contact Amy Spegal, Premier Physician Services, (800)726-3627, ext. 3682
E-mail: aspegal@premierdocs.com
Fax (937)312-3683.

OHIO - Lima
Meet your financial AND practice goals.
Named among Top 100 Hospitals, this 57,000 volume, level II ED completed an expansive, state-of-the art renovation in 2012. Excellent coverage and terrific package with productivity-based compensation plus employer-funded pension, family medical, CME, shareholder opportunity, malpractice and significant sign-on bonus.
Contact Greg Felder, Premier Physician Services, (800) 726-3627, ext 3670
e-mail gfelder@premierdocs.com.

TEXAS - Texarkana
If you thrive in a busy, high-acuity ED, then you belong here!
Our physicians love working CHRISTUS St. Michael, a beautiful, award-winning hospital with a 33-bed, 55,000-volume ED.
Enjoy scribes and mid-level support. Wonderful, mid-sized, family-friendly community that’s an outdoor-lover’s dream.
Estimated annual compensation: $450,000, plus partnership opportunity with Emergency Service Partners, L.P. in as little as one year!
Come join us!
Contact Renaldo Johnson today at: renaldo@eddocs.com for more details, and mention job #149830-12.

The Department of Emergency Medicine at Eastern Virginia Medical School is seeking candidates for a core faculty position. We have a well-established three year EM residency program (est 1981), a one year ED US Fellowship and an International Medicine Fellowship. Candidates should be residency trained in EM and ABEM/AOBEM board-certified or board-prepared.
The ideal candidate will have experience in graduate medical education and a strong interest in research with a track record of research success. Generous salary, benefits and protected time provided.
Please submit your letter of interest and CV to: Francis Counselman MD, Chairman (counself@evms.edu)

We stand for total health.

EMERGENCY PHYSICIANS
Gaiitthersburg and Largo, MD (Metropolitan Washington, D.C.)
When you join the Mid-Atlantic Permanente Medical Group (MAPMG), you’ll be able to get more out of your life and your career. As a physician-owned and managed multi-specialty group with over 1,000 physicians serving 500,000 patients at 30 medical centers, we know firsthand what it takes to advance professionally and thrive personally. That’s why we provide a comprehensive network of support services and a work and call schedule that’s designed to help you make the most of your time...both at work and at home.
Seeking BC Emergency Physicians:
• Integrated medical information system
• Excellent team approach to providing care
• Reasonable, predictable schedules
• Clinical autonomy with excellent subspecialist support
• Energetic focus on excellence and patient centered service, quality, safety and patient flow
• Comprehensive benefits
• 100% paid occurrence based malpractice
• Pension Plan
• Shareholder track and hourly opportunities are available
To apply, please contact Cooper Drangmeister at: (301) 816-6532 or apply online at: http://physiciancareers.hp.org/midatl/

Kaiser Permanente
Mid-Atlantic Permanente Medical Group, P.C.

Career vs. Life
Isn’t it time you called a truce?
Dr. Pia Myers is the passionate Medical Director of a busy pediatric ED where it’s clear she loves her job. She values the support from TeamHealth that allows her to build a rewarding career without giving up important family time. TeamHealth’s resources help her thrive at her administrative position with the organization, while the scheduling flexibility gives her time to enjoy water sports with her family. With TeamHealth, there’s no reason for her to compromise in her career or her life.
Visit myEMcareer.com to find the job that’s right for you.

Featured Opportunities:
Huntsville Memorial Hospital
Huntsville, TX – Medical Director
Nash General Hospital
Raleigh area, NC
Schneck Medical Center
Seymour, IN

855.615.0010
physicianjobs@teamhealth.com
It’s time to enter the real world.
At EMP, our game face is the face of physicians who love life and the people they work with. As a physician owned and managed group, we create the world we live in. And in our world, every physician is valued. As an EMP physician, you’ll get the support you need to thrive in your new career, and will become an equal equity owner, just like the rest of us. And benefits? Ours include the best med mal insurance anywhere and a fully-funded 401k that’s worth nearly a quarter of a million in five years. The real world is where the real fun begins—with EMP.