Physicians have been taught to advocate for breastfeeding with our patients; however, our profession makes it challenging to practice what we preach.

**Background**
The World Health Organization and American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (among many others) support breastfeeding exclusively for six months and continued breastfeeding for two years or more based on evidence showing benefits to mother and child. Some parents choose formula instead of breast milk for a variety of reasons, but in the United States, working mothers’ right to express (pump) breast milk for their infants is protected through amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. Nevertheless, returning to work correlates strongly with a decision to stop breastfeeding, particularly for those working in environments that are unsupportive.

Our workplace, the hospital, is where many mothers learn to breastfeed. Supporting breastfeeding and pumping is a key strategy in recent efforts to make hospitals “baby-friendly.” For working physicians, resources and policies that encourage pumping on shift are critical. But that’s not where it ends. Our careers, especially in academia, do not exclusively take place within the hospital walls.
ACEP Working with TJC on Common Concerns

After conducting an all-member survey to collect feedback about concerning The Joint Commission (TJC) regulations, ACEP has summarized the member responses and is working with TJC to address relevant issues. The most common concern was the ability to eat and drink in the emergency department, a regulation that ACEP worked with TJC to clarify in Feb. 2019. It was confirmed that TJC and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration don't have policies forbidding eating and drinking in the ED, but some hospitals do have their own policies. We created resources to help you advocate for improvements at your place of employment. Visit www.acep.org/letseat for all of the details and resources related to eating and drinking in the emergency department.

The second most common concern voiced by our members was the requirement for 1:1 sitters for patients who are suicidal, along with universal screening for suicidal patients. TJC recommends universal screening for suicidality but only requires it for patients who present with behavioral emergencies. TJC does, however, require 1:1 sitters for patients who are suicidal. ACEP is discussing appropriate alternatives with TJC.

Wondering what else came up in the survey by March 16, 2020? To view the qualifications needed to apply, go to www.acep.org/board-nominations.

NOMINATE YOUR PEERS FOR NATIONAL AWARDS

ACEP is accepting nominations for the 2020 ACEP Leadership & Excellence Awards, which annually honor members distinguishing themselves for leadership and excellence in emergency medicine. All members are eligible to submit nominations by March 1, 2020. Learn more at www.acep.org/leadership-awards.

We Shouldn't Compromise on Moral Convictions

I noticed in the “News from the College Section” of the December 2019 issue of ACEP Now that ACEP applauds the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York for rejecting the HHS rule that would shield health professionals who refuse to deliver care or medical services based on religious belief or conscience. It is important to remember that this is not the first time we have mentioned the importance of “lives not worth living” loudly resound.1

It should be sadly remembered that the German 1930 sterilization law was largely modeled on a draft written by Harry Laughlin at the Eugenics Record Office in Cold Spring Harbor, New York. After Hitler’s rise to chancellor in 1933, a radicalized eugenics program emerged in Germany, and its first victims were the Lebensmittel (1935-1945). The euthanasia program was initially organized and carried out by German physicians. These physicians were encouraged to move from doctrine individuals to governing the nation. Dr. J. Baroness observed in the Arrows of Internal Medicine “that physicians in Germany did not simply acquiesce; rather they accepted, supported, and were instrumental in the application of the policies.”2

Former U.S. Surgeon General Dr. C. Everett Koop stated, “At greatest risk are the poor, elderly, disabled, disadvantaged, and others without access to good medical care for whom the ‘choice of life’ could become a ‘duty of death.’”3

I have witnessed approved and authorized hostile demonstrations against Jews and also Catholics by regimes in other countries. We cannot ignore that both Papa Doc Duvalier, Haiti, and Che Guevara, Cuba, were physicians, and they were known for their brutalities. As physicians, we are not automatically immunized against inhumanity, and it appears that we can be changed by state dictates, personal agendas, career advancement, profit incentives, and personal motives.

Physicians, like any citizen, must have the right to refuse or provide treatments deemed not moral or unethical based on religious or moral conviction. As R. Orr, MD, director of clinical ethics at Loma Linda University, stated, “Become involved or the reprehensible will become the standard, and the standard of care will ultimately become your obligation.”4

Joseph M. Soler, MD, FACEP
Bradenton, Florida
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ACEP4U: Value-Based Reimbursement

ACEP CAN HELP YOU NAVIGATE PAYMENT MODELS AND MAXIMIZE PAYMENTS

by JEFFREY DAVIS

Over the last several years, there has been a movement away from reimbursing health care practitioners based on the volume of services toward rewarding them for the quality or “value” of care provided.

The Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act (MACRA) of 2015 accelerated health care payment reform efforts by establishing the Quality Payment Program (QPP), the main quality reporting program in Medicare. There are two tracks in the QPP: the Merit-Based Incentive Payment System (MIPS) and Advanced Alternative Payment Models (APMs). MIPS includes four performance categories: quality, cost, improvement activities, and promoting interoperability (formerly electronic health record “meaningful use”). Performance in these four categories (which are weighted) rolls up into an overall score that translates to a bonus that physicians receive on their Medicare payments two years after the performance period (for example, performance in 2020 impacts Medicare payments in 2022). Physicians and other health care practitioners who actively participate in certain Advanced APMs are exempt from MIPS and can receive a 5 percent payment bonus through 2024 and a higher payment fee schedule update starting in 2026.

Most emergency physicians participate in MIPS because there simply aren’t any opportunities to be in an Advanced APM. However, given the fundamental role emergency physicians play in our health care system, ACEP strongly believes that emergency physicians are well-positioned to be meaningful participants in APMs if given the opportunity.

What is an APM?

CMS defines an APM as a payment approach that gives physicians and other providers added incentive payments to provide high-quality and cost-efficient care. APMs can apply to a specific clinical condition, a care episode, or a population. Examples of APMs include accountable care organizations (ACOs), medical homes, and bundled payment models.

Advanced APMs are a subset of APMs with additional requirements, such nominal financial risks. Financial risk means that a provider participant in the APM is held financially accountable if the services they provide wind up costing more than a predetermined target. In other words, participants must owe back some or all “losses” for which they are deemed responsible.

What is the AUCM?

ACEP created the Acute Unscheduled Care Model (AUCM, pronounced “awesome”), a Medicare Advanced APM proposal designed for emergency physicians. The AUCM would provide a voluntary alternative to the traditional fee-for-service payments for Medicare patients who receive emergency care. It is structured as a bundled payment model, focusing on specific “episodes” of unscheduled acute care. Under a bundled payment approach, if the cost of an episode of care is less than a predetermined price for that episode, then a participating provider or group can keep that difference. However, if the cost winds up being more than the predetermined price, participants would be responsible for those losses and owe Medicare the difference.

The AUCM is designed to last five years and be flexible enough to allow the full spectrum of emergency physicians to participate, should they choose, from those with dedicated infrastructure and experience accepting financial risk to smaller groups of physicians who do not have as much experience in this area. Emergency physicians and groups could participate regardless of employment model (independent group, regional group, national group, employed physicians).

The overall goal of the AUCM is to improve the ability of emergency physicians to reduce inpatient admissions and observation stays when appropriate through enhanced care coordination. Emergency physicians would become key members of the continuum of care as the model focuses on ensuring follow-up care for emergency patients, minimizing redundant post-ED services, and avoiding post-ED discharge safety events that lead to follow-up ED visits or inpatient admissions.

Developing Solutions

Successful participation in MIPS has been a top priority for ACEP. In addition to working with the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) to simplify MIPS requirements, ACEP provides members with resources to ease the reporting process. Thousands of emergency physicians are now using ACEP’s Clinical Emergency Data Registry (CEDR) and participating in the Emergency Quality Network (E-QUAL) to meet reporting and attestation requirements. A brief word about CEDR. It was developed as the first EM specialty-wide registry to measure acute care quality, outcomes, practice patterns, and trends in emergency care. The CEDR registry ensures that you, rather than other parties or payers, are identifying what works best for your clinical practice and patients. In 2018, 100 percent of CEDR customers were in a positive MIPS scoring bracket and 40 percent of customers’ quality scores were above 70, qualifying them for exceptional bonus. Learn more about CEDR at www.acep.org/cedr.
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And what is E-QUAL? The E-QUAL Network is a virtual learning community designed to accelerate knowledge translation by disseminating evidence-based practices in a low-burden, high-impact manner. Emergency departments participate in an E-QUAL initiative by joining a learning collaborative offered annually focusing on a single clinical topic. Each learning collaborative has a six- to nine-month learning period during which the ED champion interacts with the virtual E-QUAL portal and reports on local quality improvement activities. Activities include engaging eligible providers in the local quality improvement project and providing access to educational toolkits, webinars, podcasts, benchmarking data, and self-assessment tools. Participation in E-QUAL can earn clinicians improvement activity credit. Learn more about E-QUAL at www.acep.org/equal.

When MACRA passed, ACEP immediately identified the gap in available emergency medicine–focused Advanced APMs. In 2015, ACEP formed the APM Task Force co-chaired by Jeff Bettinger, MD, FACEP, and Randy Pilgrim, MD, FACEP. The task force reviewed various APM proposals and eventually developed the Acute Unscheduled Care Model (AUCM, fondly known as “Awesome”). In 2017, ACEP submitted the AUCM proposal to a federal advisory committee called the Physician-Focused Payment and Innovation Model Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) for consideration.

The PTAC is tasked with recommending (PTAC) for consideration. The response of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) for consideration based on criteria established by the HHS secretary. Dr. Bettinger, Dr. Pilgrim, and Susan Nedza, MD, MBA, FACEP, presented the AUCM proposal before the PTAC on Sept. 6, 2018, and the PTAC recommended the AUCM to the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation. The AUCM met all 10 criteria established by the HHS secretary for full implementation.
2020 Course Topics

- Unusual Antibiotic Side Effects
- MRI vs. CT in the ED Setting
- Challenges of Managing Pediatric UTIs
- Emerging Issues in Anticoagulation
- Chest X-Ray, Ultrasonography, or CT?
- Headache – ACEP 2019 Guidelines
- LPs in Febrile Infants 29-60 Days Old?
- Suicidal Risk: Assessment and Intervention
- Cardiovascular Pearls, 2019
- DKA and Hyperglycemia Update
- Sore Throat: Still Trying to Get it Right
- Sexual / Racial / Ethnic Disparities in the ED
- ACS & PE – ACEP 2019 Guidelines
- Psychiatric Patients: Medical Evaluation
- Challenges of Atrial Fibrillation - Part 1
- Challenges of Atrial Fibrillation - Part 2
- Otitis Media Doesn’t Cause Fever
- Sepsis 2019: Hot Off the Press
- Pearls from Risk Management Monthly
- Pearls from ED Leadership Monthly
- Urologic Imaging Guidelines
- Pediatric Vomiting and Diarrhea
- Trauma 2019: Hot Off the Press
- Myths in Emergency Medicine
- Myths in EMS Care
- ATS / IDSA Updated Pneumonia Guidelines
- Visual Diagnosis Challenges - Part 1
- Visual Diagnosis Challenges - Part 2
- Important Recent EM Literature - Part 1*
- Important Recent EM Literature - Part 2*
- ED Staffing and Operations Forum*
- Diagnostic and Therapeutic Controversies*

*Topics listed with an asterisk (*) are 90-minute faculty panel discussions; all other topics are 30 minutes.

Experience the Course Enjoyed by Over 50,000 of Your Colleagues!

Register Today at www.EMACourse.com or Call 1-800-458-4779 (9:00am-4:30pm ET, M-F)
IN February 2013, I was contacted by a Norwegian anesthesiologist who had heard through the grapevine that there was an American emergency physician living on a potato farm in rural Norway, teaching swim lessons. That April, I was informed, they were to start a pilot project at Akershus University Hospital (AHUS), which has Norway’s largest emergency room—not a department. This is the story of how my midlife crisis morphed into helping found the specialty of emergency medicine in a country that was still just getting to know it.

The year before, after being an attending emergency medicine physician at the University of Massachusetts for 12 years, I had taken a one-year leave of absence. I moved to Norway with my Norwegian husband and our three elementary school–aged children. I knew that I would not be able to work as a physician there, as there is no reciprocity between the United States and Europe. Nonetheless, I submitted my paperwork to start the process of obtaining a Norwegian medical license (which typically takes at least six years) just in case I decided to return there one day in retirement. We enrolled our children in the local school where my husband had matriculated, and I enrolled myself in a language class for immigrants. I worked hard to learn the language and tried to make as many connections with physicians as I could.

That unexpected message was the first indication that my efforts were paying off.

Emergency Care in Norway

Norway has a population of 5.4 million and a gross domestic product of approximately $400 billion (or $75,000 per capita), making it the fourth wealthiest country in the world today. It has one of the world’s best health care systems, with universal health insurance and a well-organized primary care system that functions as a gatekeeper to specialty care. However, when I moved there, Norway did not have a specialty in emergency medicine nor a system that we would find familiar. This is the story of how my efforts were paying off.

Emergency medicine was in various phases of development throughout Europe at this time. While the United Kingdom had recognized the specialty for almost half a century, most other European countries were in their infancy with regard to emergency medicine. In 2011, the European Society for Emergency Medicine administered its first written board exam in emergency medicine. I was among the first 100 physicians who sat for this exam. It was administered in five locations throughout Europe. I flew to London for my exam, knowing that I was helping to create history. The 36 of us who passed this exam were invited to take the oral exam in Italy the following May. It was similar to an objective structured clinical examination. While it was not in a hotel room with an examiner behind a binder, I felt like my residency training and American Board of Emergency Medicine certification had prepared me well for the European exam. At the 2014 European Society for Emergency Medicine (EUSEM) conference in Amsterdam, I was recognized as one of the first 12 physicians to have passed the first written and oral emergency medicine exam in Europe.

Back at AHUS, patient care was improving. Since starting our pilot project, there had been no unexpected deaths in the emergency room. I can think of several of my patients who certainly would have died without the attending level emergency medicine supervision I was able to provide. I remember a type A dissection that I diagnosed with bedside ultrasound, an unrecognized aortic dissection, and several aortic aneurysms. I was once a cardiac anesthesiologist and a surgeon. My one-year study abroad trip had morphed into a two-year adventure.

During the same time frame, several other hospitals also began developing permanent attending emergency medicine positions in their hospitals. Simultaneous with the development of these programs, there was increased focus on emergency care in the media, and pressure on the government was mounting. At AHUS, I invited politicians and the Minister of Health to see what we were doing. I was selected by AHUS to be featured on a television documentary series, “Fa Liv Od Død” (“Of Life and Death”), that showcased a day in the life of the Norwegian health care system. Our pilot project on emergency medicine was now in the spotlight.

EM Gains Steam in Europe

Emergency medicine was in various phases of development throughout Europe at this time. While the United Kingdom had recognized the specialty for almost half a century, delays around admitting these patients to hallway beds on the cardiology floor for management. We also discharged patients faster from our observation unit. The nurses and EMS felt safer having a small, dedicated group of attending physicians in the emergency room rather than relying on inexperienced interns rotating from the various services.

Many Challenges, Many Successes

Despite the obvious improvement in patient care we provided, the specialists felt threatened, particularly the cardiologists. They did not understand our scope of practice. How could a physician who was not a cardiologist manage ventricular tachycardia or cardiovert atrial fibrillation patients? We were not even allowed to intubate, that was the anesthesiologists’ job. Despite having diagnosed tamponade, dissection, and several aortic aneurysms by bedside ultrasound, I was accused of not being trained as a radiologist. Our CEO stepped down after a staffing conflict with the nurses’ union, so we lost our support at the top. After almost one year, all success aside, our pilot program was shut down.

But it was not the end of the momentum that had started. In 2015, the Norwegian Society for Emergency Medicine (NORSEM), which had been formed in 2010 by a Norwegian emergency physician who had trained in the United States (and of which I am a board member), was asked by the Ministry of Health to help develop an education framework and curriculum for a primary specialty in emergency medicine that would comply with EUSEM’s curriculum and international guidelines. In 2017, the Minister of Health approved emergency medicine as Norway’s newest specialty. One year later, NORSEM joined the International Federation for Emergency Medicine as a full voting member. In March 2019, the Ministry of Health began accepting applications from those physicians wishing to be grandfathered in as Norway’s first emergency medicine physicians. On Oct. 17, 2019, I received confirmation that I was to be one of them. The process of approving training facilities is currently under way.

More than two decades ago, during residency, I took my first trip to Europe and had a tour of an akuttmottak in Oslo. I knew at that time that someday I would like to work as an emergency physician in Norway. I knew I would first have to learn the language. I didn’t know that I would have to help create the entire specialty. It was a pipe dream, but with hard work, good timing, and a little luck, that pipe dream came true.

I’m back in the States now with no immediate plans to move back to Norway. But if and when I do, I can proudly work as an emergency physician.
The High Risk Emergency Medicine course is designed and taught by emergency physicians and medical malpractice attorneys; a comprehensive review of the medical-legal issues inherent to the practice of Emergency Medicine.

September 1-2, 2020  |  Las Vegas, NV

The Heart Course provides an opportunity for frontline providers of emergency cardiology to learn, discuss, and apply emerging data, new guidelines, and optimal treatment strategies for the management of cardiac and vascular emergencies.

November 2-5, 2020  |  Las Vegas, NV

The Center for Emergency Medical Education is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education (ACCME) to provide continuing medical education for physicians. Please visit www.ceme.org for AMA PRA Category 1 Credits™ information.
When Do Patients Arrive in the ED?

Most emergency departments have a recognizable patient arrival pattern. This graph depicts the average pattern of select Emergency Department Benchmarking Alliance departments. Interestingly, almost 50 percent of patients on this graph are seen outside of normal business hours (Monday through Friday, 8 a.m.–5 p.m.). When weekends are taken into account, this number increases to 62 percent.
Mary Ann Edens, MD, FACEP, EM residency director at Louisiana Health Shreveport, had just moved to Shreveport when a nurse invited her to attend a Krewe meeting. She was instantly hooked, drawn to the Krewe’s charitable work and how Mardi Gras “brings a sense of pride to the community.” A member of the Krewe of Gemini since 2011, last year she served as captain, spending two years planning the year’s programming, including overseeing fundraising, budgeting, picking the theme “Gemini’s World Adventure,” helping to design the costumes and floats, and planning the Grand Bal. Dr. Edens says the Krewe’s time commitment is significant but worth it. “[Emergency physicians] deal with the struggles of life and death every day. … But Mardi Gras gives everyone hope—hope for something better that is coming around the bend. Couldn’t think of a better stress reliever than that!”

Michael D. Smith, MD, MBA, CPE, FACEP, director of the Ochsner Clinical Simulation and Patient Safety Center in New Orleans, spends his time at work “taking care of the people who have had too much Mardi Gras,” he jokes. But in his off time, he gets to be part of the fun. Dr. Smith and his wife joined the Krewe of King Arthur last year after she had previously been part of the all-female Mystic Krewe of Nyx. He says the Carnival season, which starts in early January, “envelopes the whole area. Kids get off school for the last week of Carnival, and you plan your days and nights around the multiple parades per day.” Now it’s a family affair for the Smiths, whose 11-year-old twin daughters were on the Krewe of King Arthur Royal Court during its 2020 ball in January.

Angela Cornelius, MD, FACEP, watched her fellow FACEP in the Crowd, Dr. Edens, participate in Krewe of Gemini for several years and knew she had to get involved after riding in her first Mardi Gras parade. “The people were so fun, and their love for Mardi Gras is absolutely contagious!” When she realized the Krewe was a community service organization, she loved the idea of making new friends while giving back to her community. “It’s hard to meet those who are outside the hospital. This has given me the opportunity to get to know people from the community who I would have never had a chance to meet.” She uses the organizational and multitasking skills she has developed in the emergency department to plan her Krewe’s annual Grand Bal, attended by more than 1,000 revelers.

*FACEPs in the Crowd* in honor of Mardi Gras this month, we’re spotlighting three emergency physicians who are Krewe members, working with their social organizations year-round to plan charitable activities and Carnival events.

**MARY ANN EDENS, MD, FACEP**

Mary Ann Edens, MD, FACEP, EM residency director at Louisiana Health Shreveport, had just moved to Shreveport when a nurse invited her to attend a Krewe meeting. She was instantly hooked, drawn to the Krewe’s charitable work and how Mardi Gras “brings a sense of pride to the community.” A member of the Krewe of Gemini since 2011, last year she served as captain, spending two years planning the year’s programming, including overseeing fundraising, budgeting, picking the theme “Gemini’s World Adventure,” helping to design the costumes and floats, and planning the Grand Bal. Dr. Edens says the Krewe’s time commitment is significant but worth it. “[Emergency physicians] deal with the struggles of life and death every day. … But Mardi Gras gives everyone hope—hope for something better that is coming around the bend. Couldn’t think of a better stress reliever than that!”

**MICHAEL D. SMITH, MD, MBA, CPE, FACEP**

Michael D. Smith, MD, MBA, CPE, FACEP, director of the Ochsner Clinical Simulation and Patient Safety Center in New Orleans, spends his time at work “taking care of the people who have had too much Mardi Gras,” he jokes. But in his off time, he gets to be part of the fun. Dr. Smith and his wife joined the Krewe of King Arthur last year after she had previously been part of the all-female Mystic Krewe of Nyx. He says the Carnival season, which starts in early January, “envelopes the whole area. Kids get off school for the last week of Carnival, and you plan your days and nights around the multiple parades per day.” Now it’s a family affair for the Smiths, whose 11-year-old twin daughters were on the Krewe of King Arthur Royal Court during its 2020 ball in January.

**ANGELA CORNELIUS, MD, FACEP**

Angela Cornelius, MD, FACEP, watched her fellow FACEP in the Crowd, Dr. Edens, participate in Krewe of Gemini for several years and knew she had to get involved after riding in her first Mardi Gras parade. “The people were so fun, and their love for Mardi Gras is absolutely contagious!” When she realized the Krewe was a community service organization, she loved the idea of making new friends while giving back to her community. “It’s hard to meet those who are outside the hospital. This has given me the opportunity to get to know people from the community who I would have never had a chance to meet.” She uses the organizational and multitasking skills she has developed in the emergency department to plan her Krewe’s annual Grand Bal, attended by more than 1,000 revelers.

**KNOW AN EMERGENCY PHYSICIAN WHO SHOULD BE FEATURED IN “FACEPs IN THE CROWD”? SEND YOUR SUGGESTIONS TO ACEPnow@ACEP.ORG. LEARN HOW TO BECOME A FACEP AT WWW.ACEP.ORG/FACEPsINTHECROWD.**
Naloxone Just One Piece of the Opioid Puzzle

NALOXONE WITHOUT TREATMENT ENGAGEMENT DOESN’T PROLONG LIFE—IT SIMPLY DELAYS DEATH

by KEVIN LOZO AND LEWIS S. NELSON, MD

In overdoses nearly tripled in the United States between 1999 and 2014. The majority involved opioids.1 The need to prevent overdose-related deaths is an absolute priority. Comprehensive strategies to address the opioid epidemic are moot if the patients are not alive. But are we training on naloxone too much? What does the evidence say?

Naloxone—a mu opioid receptor competitive antagonist—has the ability to reverse the clinical effects of an opioid overdose. Naloxone is easily administered and nonaddictive and poses no health risks to the opioid-free patient. Over the last decade, naloxone availability has widened nationwide in a variety of environments.

Two areas of substantial interest are expanding bystander access and extra-clinical access. Laypersons (or off-duty provider) availability may be possible through institutional programs that dispense naloxone. Access outside of health care settings is possible via prescriptions for naloxone or, in some jurisdictions, via a centralized standing order. This means that anyone can obtain naloxone from a pharmacy and deliver it to a patient any time it is deemed necessary.

The necessity of this approach extends globally. In 2014, the World Health Organization conducted a systematic review that concluded “people likely to witness an opioid overdose should have access to naloxone and be instructed in its administration to enable them to use it for the emergency management of suspected opioid overdose.”2 Since then, a broad range of literature has emerged evaluating naloxone distribution and education programs, supporting the general conclusion that, due to naloxone’s lifesaving potential and favorable safety profile, bystander access and use should be implemented while data from more rigorous and longer-term evaluations are gathered.

What the Data Say

Thus far, the data from available studies largely focus on outcomes that are merely surrogate measures of success. When scrutinized, they do not consistently correlate with the outcome of interest: saving a life without onloading undue risk (eg, favorable risk-benefit ratio). The lack of outcome data and number of simultaneous variables followed complicated the determination of naloxone’s impact on public health. Although some studies suggest naloxone availability is associated with lower deaths from opioid overdose, the data are limited to retrospective studies and highly confounded.3 Randomized, controlled trials would provide more information but would be very difficult, if not unethical, to do. Overall, the studies and recommendations have appropriately encouraged policymakers and funders to increase the availability of bystander naloxone. To be clear, naloxone dispensing and prescribing should unquestionably be expanded until better data suggest otherwise.

Here’s where things get complicated. Yes, saving an individual from a fatal overdose is not only a worthwhile goal but an essential responsibility of our health care system. What muddies this pursuit is only four out of 10 opioid overdoses are fatal.4

This number may overestimate naloxone’s importance because of the tremendous difficulty determining whether an opioid overdose would have been fatal without it. Many patients demonstrating an opioid-like toxidrome appear moribund, but in reality, the vast majority will soon awaken. While a physician utilizes extensive training and physiological monitoring to determine the risk of impending death, laypersons with naloxone have to make the same decisions often without ample clinical experience to guide them. When naloxone is given to people who would not likely die (and therefore derive no benefit), well-meeting bystanders onload the risk of precipitating withdrawal. The risk of this is not inconsequential. Precipitated withdrawal increases catecholamine concentrations and can cause pulmonary edema, myocardial infarction, and intracranial hemorrhage. Furthermore, the associated vomiting may lead to aspiration if the patient does not awaken, often due to the presence of a coinstant. Additionally, the dangers around precipitated withdrawal may actually be increasing over time. How? Opioid withdrawal occurs proportionate to the degree of dependence and the dose and rate of naloxone administration. Modern opioid use disorder patients may be more physiologically at risk than patients in the past were. This may stem from changes in methadone use, higher purity of heroin, and the availability of potent fentanyl analogs.5

Naloxone Can’t Do It Alone

Naloxone is the just beginning of the solution, even if it reverses a fatal overdose as intended. One in 10 patients treated with naloxone dies within one year, with a standardized mortality ratio of 2.6.8 Regardless of the source of patients’ opioid use, engaging them in a medication-assisted treatment program is critical to preventing additional adverse events. Unfortunately, these interventions are often unavailable and underutilized.8

Meanwhile, naloxone is beginning to be viewed by outside observers as something more than it may be. For example, every naloxone administration is regularly reported as a “save” from an “overdose death.” There are complexities in both of these phrases. As detailed above, naloxone has a very small chance of actually “saving” any specific individual from death, and its use would be better phrased as “reversed an opioid overdose” even this is complicated since there is no correct amount of heroin or prescription opioid when the cause of the use is abuse; by those standards, any amount is technically an “overdose.” Furthermore, naloxone is often stated to “reduce the risk of overdose.” However, there is no evidence that naloxone can or will decrease the risk of opioid overdose, only that it may reduce the risk of opioid overdose fatality following an overdose.7 As innocent and well-intended as public health messaging may be, misrepresenting the effect of naloxone in the media leads lawmakers and the general public to overestimate the true benefit and underestimate the true risk. The downside of this is that other equally important approaches to the opioid epidemic may be getting less attention and funding.

A discussion about naloxone would not be complete without mentioning risk compensation, where increased access to naloxone may actually encourage users to engage in higher-risk behavior. Two economists recently stirred controversy after publishing an article in which they concluded that naloxone may increase opioid abuse by “reducing the risk of death per use, thereby making riskier opioid use more appealing, and saving the lives of active drug users, who survive to continue abusing opioids.” Some critics correctly responded that naloxone has been inadequately studied in this context, and some evidence points to the contrary. However such effects are well-described in the public health literature in other contexts such as airbag use and public health warnings of potent batches of drugs.9,10

Moreover, despite expanding training opportunities for naloxone administration, the opioid overdose fatality rate continues to rise. The apparent paradox is the number of naloxone administration programs increases in parallel with the number of opioid overdose deaths.11 Concerning as that may be, this observation cannot imply causality. Did naloxone distribution programs respond to an increasing demand, or did overdose deaths increase due to increased access to naloxone? However, this finding is itself confounded, and the increase in deaths may be due to the changes around decreased opioid prescriptions (shunting some of those patients to heroin) and from heroin to synthetic opioids such as fentanyl.12

While naloxone’s role in overdose risk is still unclear, despite its increased availability, about half of those who die following naloxone treatment do so within a month of treatment.13 This clearly illustrates the need for further intervention, regardless of naloxone’s influence on future overdose.

What Else Is Needed

Any comprehensive solution to this nationwide crisis must be three-pronged: ending the...
Finding Opioid Abuse Treatment That Fits

ONE APPROACH TO PRECIPITATED WITHDRAWAL AND PREHOSPITAL BUPRENORPHINE AFTER NALOXONE RESCUE

by RACHEL HAROZ, MD; GERARD G. CARROLL, MD; AND REUBEN J. STRAYER, MD

A bstinence-related, or spontaneous, withdrawal occurs gradually over hours to days, whereas precipitated withdrawal, caused by the administration of a receptor antagonist, occurs suddenly and with immediate peak intensity. Precipitated withdrawal is therefore often much more severe and distressing and more likely to be dangerous. In the case of opioid dependence, precipitated withdrawal is best known to occur after the administration of naloxone, a mu receptor antagonist. Though opioid withdrawal syndrome (OWS) is classically thought to be unpleasant but benign, precipitated withdrawal causes an autonomic storm, which may be hazardous, especially in patients without generous cardiorespiratory reserve, in addition to physiological derangements that are often extremely unpleasant (total body pain, vomiting, diarrhea) and, perhaps most important, intense psychological dysphoria that may be unbearable and lead to desperate acts in search of relief. The prospect of OWS can lead opioid use disorder (OUD) patients to fear entering the health care system and is postulated to sometimes delay the summoning of emergency services to treat overdose.

Treatment Options

Naloxone is a lifesaving overdose rescue medication, but it can be overtutilized and used at too high a dose. Health care professionals should differentiate between the patient who is dangerously opioid toxic, with physiologically consequential respiratory depression, and the patient who is somnolent, even poorly arousable, but ventilating adequately. The latter patient should usually not be treated with naloxone but rather allowed to recover through natural metabolism under close observation. Opioid-toxic patients who have dangerous respiratory depression but are not at imminent risk of decompensation should receive small doses of intranasal naloxone (eg, 0.04 mg) titrated every few minutes to adequate ventilation, not titrated to arousal.

Buprenorphine, a partial agonist with a mu receptor affinity higher than almost any other opioid, can similarly precipitate withdrawal in opioid-dependent patients by displacing the full agonist on the receptor, leading to a loss of agonism and subsequent buprenorphine-precipitated withdrawal (BPW). Traditionally, a brief course of rapid titration of OUD has been initiated using small doses (2–4 mg sublingually) only after a period of abstinence and the development of spontaneous withdrawal (often determined by satisfying a Clinical Opiate Withdrawal Scale score of greater than 8). These “test doses” are used to determine whether the patient is in sufficient withdrawal to avoid BPW. If the patient’s symptoms are improved (or at least do not worsen), increased doses are given. But if these smaller doses cause BPW, the process is halted, and symptoms are treated with non-agonist medications (eg, clonidine, ondansetron). Several hours later, if the patient is willing, buprenorphine initiation can be reattempted.

An Alternative Approach

A growing body of experience supports an alternative approach: the treatment of BPW with higher doses of buprenorphine. Early experience demonstrates this strategy to be significantly more effective in treating withdrawal symptoms than non-agonists. This pathway demonstrates buprenorphine’s ability to abolish OWS and cravings while simultaneously transitioning the patient to medication-assisted therapy–based recovery. Future initiation pathways will likely skip the test doses and proceed to a single big dose (16 mg sublingually), which appears less likely to precipitate withdrawal and provides long-lasting protection from spontaneous withdrawal, cravings, and overdose. Protocols around high-dose initiation that account for appropriate patient selection and the possibility of provoking both protracted withdrawal and buprenorphine toxicity are being developed.

In Camden, New Jersey, our institution sits in an area with a high prevalence of opioid overdose and medical complications related to OUD. Our emergency department, recognizing its pivotal frontline role, waived all of our physicians to prescribe buprenorphine and opened a multidisciplinary bridge clinic where emergency patients could be immediately referred to facilitate ongoing buprenorphine therapy while outpatient comprehensive addiction care is arranged. We currently have the ability to bridge 22 patients weekly.

As our program developed, we found that traditional buprenorphine titration was poorly suited to the demands of our emergency department. As a result, many patients—even those in moderate withdrawal—were discharged with a buprenorphine prescription for home initiation. When we examined our resources in the prehospital arena, we were alarmed to discover that, in 2019, more than one-third of patients treated in the field for overdose refused transport to the emergency department. This resulted in a significant health care gap as well as provider frustration with patients who required rescue repeatedly, in some cases with multiple overdoses in a single day. Our opportunity to engage this population was during the brief EMS encounter; we therefore started a program aimed at administering buprenorphine after naloxone reversal and directly linking these patients to care, all within the constraints of an busy EMS system.

Though published evidence is scant, through experience we have learned that high doses of buprenorphine are less likely to precipitate withdrawal and can rapidly and effectively treat naloxone-precipitated withdrawal (NPW). We created an EMD protocol where we treat NPW with 16–24 mg of sublingual buprenorphine.

In the first months of this program, results have been overwhelmingly positive: Patients have done well, NPW symptoms have been relieved, BPW has not occurred, and scene times and unit availability have not been affected. Remarkably, we have found no difference in bridge clinic follow-up rates between patients who refuse versus allow ED transport. To date, almost 70 percent of patients with OUD rescued in the field have attended their first clinic appointment. This program also fundamentally changed the relationship of EMS providers to this underserved, vulnerable, and challenging population. “Just another overdose” is now an opportunity to make a difference.

Treatments That Work for Patients

OUD patients presenting to the emergency department and to EMS, whether after an overdose or due to medical complications related to opioid use, are at extraordinary risk for short-term mortality. Emergency providers can have a significant impact on outcomes by initiating buprenorphine treatment and referring patients for ongoing medication-based addiction care. However, traditional time-intensive initiation models are discordant with emergency care, where we often have only a brief window to engage these patients, especially patients in withdrawal, who are very likely to decline further care and leave.

Most patients find withdrawal symptoms intolerable, and despite being given a buprenorphine prescription at discharge, many are unable to bear the development of severe enough OWS to initiate buprenorphine at home using a conventional gradual dosing strategy. Treating precipitated withdrawal with high-dose buprenorphine has the potential to close this treatment gap by quickly relieving withdrawal symptoms without the fear of precipitated withdrawal. Administration of 16–24 mg of buprenorphine binds a high fraction of the patient’s opioid receptors, which decreases cravings, prevents withdrawal, and protects the patient from opioid overdose for 24 hours or longer. Initiating high-dose buprenorphine to ED and EMS patients with low Clinical Opiate Withdrawal Scale scores may therefore allow successful transition to buprenorphine for patients who would otherwise fail to establish therapy.

Though these strategies are in their infancy, they have thus far been demonstrated to be safe and effective. While more experience and outcome data are needed, treatment of precipitated withdrawal with high-dose buprenorphine has the potential to significantly expand the reach of emergency providers at the front lines of addiction care. ☑

DR. HAROZ is assistant professor of emergency medicine at Cooper Medical School of Rowan University and division head, toxicology and addiction medicine, in the department of emergency medicine at Cooper University Health Care in Camden, New Jersey.

DR. CARROLL is assistant professor of emergency medicine and EMS fellowship director at Cooper Medical School of Rowan University and medical director, division of EMS and disaster medicine, in the department of emergency medicine at Cooper University Health Care.

DR. STRAYER is associate medical director of emergency medicine at Maimonides Medical Center in Brooklyn, New York.
A HUMBLING CONDITION
SPOT AND TREAT CAUDA EQUINA SYNDROME

by BRIT LONG, MD, FACEP, AND ALEX KOYFMAN, MD, FACEP, FAAEM

The Case
A 58-year-old male presents with worsening lower back pain. He has a history of L4/L5 disc disease and has been seen in this emergency department for this pain previously. Today, he says his back pain is different: It’s more severe and radiates down to both feet, and he notes some difficulty urinating. Could this be cauda equina syndrome (CES)? What should you look for on history and exam? Is there anything you can use to rule out the disease before heading to the MRI machine?

Characteristics of CES
We regularly see patients with severe back pain, and we are experts at screening for potentially dangerous conditions. When it comes to back pain, we are on the lookout for pyelonephritis, fracture, spinal epidural abscess/discitis, spinal epidural hematoma, mass, abdominal aortic aneurysm, retroperitoneal hematoma, and CES, as well as a variety of potential abdominal conditions.

The challenge is that CES is more complex than that patient with worsening back pain and urinary changes. When we miss CES, it is often because we failed to consider the condition as a possibility. That cognitive error can lead to completing an inadequate history and exam and failing to perform the right diagnostic tests.

Any impingement or damage to these nerve roots may result in CES. While CES is most commonly due to central disc herniation or prolapse (usually in the setting of prior spinal disease), many conditions are associated with CES including chemotherapy, infection, radiation, vascular lesions, ischemia, trauma, epidural analgesia, and others.

Table 1: Features Suggesting CES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION</th>
<th>FINDINGS (DECREASING ORDER OF IMPACT ON PROGNOSIS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Bladder dysfunction (urinary retention, incontinence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual dysfunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe back pain that suddenly worsened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bilateral sciatica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>Decreased perineal/urinary sensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motor weakness in lower extremities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depressed patellar and Achilles reflexes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Reliability of History and Examination in CES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURE</th>
<th>SENSITIVITY (95% CI)</th>
<th>SPECIFICITY (95% CI)</th>
<th>LR- (95% CI)</th>
<th>LR+ (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back pain</td>
<td>34% (26–42%)</td>
<td>62% (51–72%)</td>
<td>0.64 (0.26–1.60)</td>
<td>1.98 (1.52–2.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciatica</td>
<td>43% (30–56%)</td>
<td>66% (59–73%)</td>
<td>0.90 (0.61–1.30)</td>
<td>1.50 (0.80–2.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perineal anesthesia</td>
<td>38% (28–49%)</td>
<td>85% (81–89%)</td>
<td>0.80 (0.61–1.05)</td>
<td>2.00 (0.92–4.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinary retention</td>
<td>25% (17–35%)</td>
<td>72% (65–79%)</td>
<td>0.99 (0.82–1.20)</td>
<td>0.84 (0.53–1.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinary incontinence</td>
<td>24% (16–33%)</td>
<td>70% (61–77%)</td>
<td>1.05 (0.92–1.20)</td>
<td>0.76 (0.50–1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowel incontinence</td>
<td>19% (9–33%)</td>
<td>86% (80–91%)</td>
<td>0.97 (0.78–1.20)</td>
<td>1.60 (0.66–3.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced anal tone</td>
<td>30% (16–49%)</td>
<td>83% (76–88%)</td>
<td>0.90 (0.73–1.12)</td>
<td>1.83 (1.00–3.33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CES STAGES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CES Suspected</td>
<td>Bilateral radicular pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES Incomplete</td>
<td>Urinary difficulties of neurogenic origin (altered urinary sensation, loss of desire to void, poor urinary stream, need to strain to micturate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES Retention</td>
<td>Neurogenic urine retention (painless urinary retention with overflow incontinence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES Complete</td>
<td>Objective loss of cauda equina function, absent perineal sensation, patulous anus, paralyzed and insensitive bladder/bowel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MRI of the lumbar spine of a 29-year-old female diagnosed with cauda equina syndrome.
Though this likely underestimates the sensitivity and specificity for MRI when evaluating for CES. Unfortunately, MRI may not be feasible in all centers. The next best option is a CT myelogram, but this is also difficult as it requires placement of a spinal needle into the spinal canal for injection of contrast dye. What about lumbar and sacral CT with IV contrast? One study of 151 patients suggests that CT findings showing more than 50 percent thecal sac effacement has a specificity of 86 percent for diagnosis of CES, while less than 50 percent effacement is able to rule out CES with a sensitivity of 98 percent. These data have not been validated (ie, they are not ready for prime time just yet), but keep a lookout for more literature evaluating CT with contrast in the future.

If you suspect the condition based on your history, exam, and PVR, you should discuss the case with a spinal surgeon. They will assist in determining further workup and management. Treatment includes operative management in patients with CES. Data suggest patients with rapid onset of symptoms (typically defined as 24 hours) and worsening bladder function benefit the most from surgery, preferably within 24 hours of presentation, with operative delays beyond 48 hours can result in permanent dysfunction.

Case Resolution
Your exam demonstrates decreased perineal sensation and weakness in L5 bilateral. When questioned, the patient also highlights changes in bowel function. The patient’s PVR is 400 mL, and you call the surgeon, who asks for an MRI. The MRI demonstrates central disc protrusion at L5/S1. The patient is admitted and taken to the operating room.

References
11. Voss AC, Schmeling H, Brachmann R. Recurrent perineal sensory changes and retention, focal neurological deficits, and perineal sensory changes, ask about the severity of CES (based on studies with confirmed CES on imaging), and its reliability varies significantly among providers. While a consulting surgeon may ask you about rectal tone, don’t rely on it to rule in or rule out CES. An absent anal wink reflex, assessed by gently stroking the skin around the anus with a cotton swab or applicator and looking for contraction of the external anal sphincter, suggests sacral nerve root dysfunction.

Another confusing aspect about CES is its classifications—more than 15 total! Rather than using all of these systems, we teach them with confidence. The gold standard test for suspected CES is MRI, preferably within 24 hours of presentation (though we teach them with confidence).

Urinary retention and incontinence have a specificity of 72 percent and 70 percent, respectively. What about the rectal exam? Unfortunately, there are not great data differentiating CES from conditions that may mimic CES. An absent anal wink reflex, assessed by gently stroking the skin around the anus with a cotton swab or applicator and looking for contraction of the external anal sphincter, suggests sacral nerve root dysfunction.

Tests and Treatment
If you suspect the disease based on your history and exam, what next? Labs are not helpful. X-rays are unreliable. Bladder ultrasound for postvoid residual (PVR) can evaluate for urinary retention. In CES, urinary retention and incontinence possess a specificity of 85 percent and 86 percent, respectively. If you suspect the condition based on your history, exam, and PVR, you should discuss the case with a spinal surgeon. They will assist in determining further workup and management. Treatment includes operative management in patients with CES. Data suggest patients with rapid onset of symptoms (typically defined as 24 hours) and worsening bladder function benefit the most from surgery, preferably within 24 hours of presentation, with operative delays beyond 48 hours can result in permanent dysfunction.

Case Resolution
Your exam demonstrates decreased perineal sensation and weakness in L5 bilateral. When questioned, the patient also highlights changes in bowel function. The patient’s PVR is 400 mL, and you call the surgeon, who asks for an MRI. The MRI demonstrates central disc protrusion at L5/S1. The patient is admitted and taken to the operating room.
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Urinary retention and incontinence have a specificity of 72 percent and 70 percent, respectively. What about the rectal exam? Unfortunately, there are not great data differentiating CES from conditions that may mimic CES. An absent anal wink reflex, assessed by gently stroking the skin around the anus with a cotton swab or applicator and looking for contraction of the external anal sphincter, suggests sacral nerve root dysfunction.

Another confusing aspect about CES is its classifications—more than 15 total! Rather than using all of these systems, we advocate for thinking about CES as occurring in stages (see Table 3). The prognosis worsens with more advanced stages (stage a, or complete, is far worse than stage b, or suspected). Complete CES, or stage 4, is usually associated with irreversible deficits.
or septic shock, mortality fell from 40.4 percent to 8.5 percent. This result was both extra-
ordinary and almost implausible, despite some compelling physiological justifications bolstering the theory.

The hype could barely be controlled. Some physicians began using the cocktail right away. A flurry of trials were designed and approved by hospital review boards around the globe. Trialsist moved as quickly as they could to begin studying this seriously and employing a variety of rigorous method-
ologies, assessing various patient populations and a variety of outcome measures. We needed some answers, and we needed them quickly.

Last month, the results from the Vitamin C, Hydrocortisone and Thiamine in Patients With Septic Shock (VITAMINS) trial, the first major international multicenter randomized, controlled effort to be completed, were un-
veiled in JAMA.

The findings: negative. Across the board.

The Results

For virtually every outcome that the authors assessed for efficacy in septic shock, the patients who received the vitamin C–based (often referred to as the Marik protocol) cocktail, metabolic resuscitation, or HAT for hy-
drocortisone, ascorbic acid, and thiamine) experienced no added benefit over patients who received hydrocorti-
sone only.

The study’s primary outcome was duration of time alive and free of vasopressor admin-
istration up to day 7 of treatment. The trial, which enrolled patients from 10 hospitals in Australia, New Zealand, and Brazil, also re-
ported data on 10 prespecified secondary out-
comes, including 28- and 90-day mortality, the need for dialysis, and mechanical venti-
lation, among others. For each of these, the Marik protocol failed to bestow any benefit.

Out of 10 secondary outcomes, the only sig-
nal of benefit to emerge from the VITAMINS trial was a one-point improvement over con-
trols in the sequential organ failure assess-
ment score. However, as the other outcomes clearly demonstrate, patients who received the Marik protocol fared no better overall in any patient-centered outcome. Numerically, though not statistically, more deaths actual-
ly occurred in the vitamin C cocktail group. (In fairness, this was not even a trend; it is only worth mentioning because so few patients died in the vitamin C group in the 2017 study.)

This will be seen as a major disappoint-
ment for observers desperately looking for

NUZYRA® (omadacycline) injection for intravenous use

NUZYRA® (omadacycline) tablets, for oral use

BRIEF SUMMARY OF FULL PRESCRIBING INFORMATION

For complete details, please see full Prescribing Information.

INDICATIONS AND USAGE

Community-Acquired Bacterial Pneumonia (CABP)

NUZYRA® is indicated for the treatment of adult patients with community-
acquired bacterial pneumonia (CABP) caused by the following susceptible microorganisms:
Streptococcus pneumoniae, Staphylococcus aureus (methicillin-
susceptible and -resistant isolates), Staphylococcus lugdunensis, Streptococcus pyogenes, Streptococcus anginosus gsp (includes S. anginosus, S. intermedius, and S. constellatus), Enterococcus faecalis, Enterobacter cloacae, and Klebsiella pneumoniae.

Acute Bacterial Skin and Skin Structure Infections (ABSSSI)

NUZYRA® is indicated for the treatment of adult patients with acute bacterial skin and skin structure infections (ABSSSI) caused by the following susceptible microorganisms: Staphylococcus aureus (methicillin-
susceptible and -resistant isolates), Staphylococcus lugdunensis, Streptococcus pyogenes, Streptococcus anginosus gsp (includes S. anginosus, S. intermedius, and S. constellatus), Enterococcus faecalis, Enterobacter cloacae, and Klebsiella pneumoniae.

USAGE: To reduce the development of drug-resistant bacteria and maintain the effectiveness of NUZYRA® and other antibacterial drugs, NUZYRA® should be used only to treat or prevent infections that are proven or strongly suspected to be caused by susceptible bacteria. When culture and susceptibility information are available, they should be considered in selecting or modifying antibacterial therapy. In the absence of such data, local epidemiology and susceptibility patterns may contribute to the selection of an antibacterial agent.

CONTRAINDICATIONS:

NUZYRA® is contraindicated in patients with known hypersensitivity to omadacycline or tetracycline-class antibacterial drugs, or to any of the excipients.

WARNINGS AND PRECAUTIONS

Mortality Imbalance in Patients with Community-Acquired Bacterial Pneumonia

Mortality imbalance was observed in the CABP clinical trials with eight deaths (2%) occurring in patients treated with NUZYRA compared to four deaths (1%) in patients treated with moxifloxacin and placebo, respectively. All deaths, in both treatment arms, occurred in patients ≥65 years of age. Most patients had multiple comorbidities. The causes of death varied and included worsening and/or complications of infections and underlying conditions. Closely monitor clinical response to therapy in CABP patients, particularly those at higher risk for mortality.

Tooth Discoloration and Enamel Hypoplasia:
The use of NUZYRA® during tooth development (best half of pregnancy, infancy, and childhood) up to the age of 8 years may cause permanent discoloration of the teeth (yellow-gray-brown). This adverse reaction is more common during long-
term use of the tetracycline-class drugs, but it has been observed following repeated short-term courses. Enamel hypoplasia has also been reported with tetracycline-class drugs. Advise the patient of the potential risk to the fetus if NUZYRA® is used during the second or third trimester of pregnancy.

Inhibition of Bone Growth

The use of NUZYRA® during the second and third trimester of pregnancy, infancy, and childhood (up to the age of 8 years) may cause reversible inhibition of bone growth. There is a risk of calcification of the ductus arteriosus in infants. A decrease in fibulina growth rate has been observed in premature infants given oral tetracycline in doses of 20 mg/kg every 4 hours. The evidence was shown to be reversible when the drug was discontinued. Advise the patient of the potential risk to the fetus if NUZYRA® is used during the second or third trimester of pregnancy.

Hypermobility Reactions

Hypermobility reactions have been reported with NUZYRA®.

Life-threatening hypermobility (epochlytic) reactions have been reported with other tetracycline-class antibacterial drugs. NUZYRA® is structurally similar to other tetracycline-class antibacterial drugs and a contraindication in patients with known hypermobility to tetracycline-class antibacterial drugs. Discontinue NUZYRA® if an allergic reaction occurs.

Clostridium difficile-Associated Diarrhea

Clostridium difficile-associated diarrhea (CDAD) has been reported in up to 2.6% of patients treated with NUZYRA® and 2.8% (0.7%) of patients treated with moxifloxacin. CDAD may range in severity from mild diarrhea to fatal colitis. Treatment with anti-anabolic agents alters the normal flora of the colon leading to overgrowth of C. difficile. C. difficile produces toxin A and B which contribute to the development of CDAD. Hypersensitivity reactions of C. difficile cause increased mortality and morbidity, as these infections can be refractory to anti-bacterial therapy and may require colonicycly. CDAD must be considered in all patients who present with diarrhea following antibacterial use.

Careful medical history is necessary since CDAD has been reported to occur over two months after the administration of antibacterial agents. If CDAD is suspected or confirmed, ongoing antibacterial drug use not directed against C. difficile may need to be discontinued. Appropriate fluid and electrolyte management, protein supplementation, antibacterial drug treatment of C. difficile, and surgical evaluation should be instituted as clinically indicated.

Tetracycline-Class Effects:

NUZYRA® is structurally similar to tetracycline-
class antibacterial drugs and may have similar adverse reactions. It may cause reversible inhibition of bone growth and may have an anti-anabolic action (which has led to increased BUN, azotemia, acidosis, hyperglycemia, proteinuria, and abnormal liver function tests), have been reported for other tetracycline-class antibacterial drugs, and may occur with NUZYRA®. Discontinue NUZYRA® if any of these adverse reactions are suspected.

Development of Drug-Resistant Bacteria:

Prescribing NUZYRA® in the absence of a proven or strongly suspected infection is unlikely to provide benefit to the patient and increases the risk of the development of drug-resistant bacteria.

ADVERSE REACTIONS:
The following clinically significant adverse reactions are ordered by increasing order in the Warnings and Precautions section of the labeling:

• Mortality imbalance in Patients with Community-
Acquired Bacterial Pneumonia

• Tooth Development and Enamel Hypoplasia

• Inhibition of Bone Growth

• Tetracycline-Class Effects

Clinical Trials Experience:

Because clinical trials are conducted under widely varying conditions, adverse reaction rates observed in the clinical trials of a drug cannot be directly compared to rates in the clinical trials of another drug, and may not reflect the rates observed in practice.

Overview of the Safety Evaluation of NUZYRA:

NUZYRA® was evaluated in three Phase 3 clinical trials (Trial 1, Trial 2 and Trial 3). These trials included a single Phase 3 trial in CABP patients (Trial 1) and two Phase 3 trials in ABSSSI patients (Trial 2 and Trial 3). A total of 1,253 patients were treated with NUZYRA® (382 patients in Trial 1 and 871 in Trials 2 and 3) or placebo (157 patients in Trial 1). Over the course of these three Phase 3 clinical trials (Trial 1, Trial 2, and Trial 3), a total of 3,418 patients were treated with NUZYRA® and 2,388 (67%) patients treated with moxifloxacin. NUZYRA® and 273/388 (70%) patients treated with moxifloxacin.

Table I: Adverse Reactions Occurring in ≥2% of Patients Receiving NUZYRA in Trial 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverse Reaction</th>
<th>NUZYRA® N = 382</th>
<th>Moxifloxacin N = 2,388</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alopecia</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthenia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacterial Infection</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood and lymphatic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradycardia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convulsions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constipation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatitis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dizziness</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowsiness</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecchymosis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eruption</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flushing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrointestinal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headache</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypersensitivity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenza-like Illness</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meningitis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nausea</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous System</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paresthesia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rash</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. FAUST is Medical Editor in Chief of ACEP Now, an online journal of the American College of Emergency Physicians (ACEP), and an attending physician in the department of emergency medicine at Brigham and Women’s Hospital in Boston. Follow him on twitter @JeremyFaust.
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Antibiotic Stewardship

The 5 D’s of antibiotic stewardship

Avoid “double coverage” for uncomplicated cellulitis.

Do not use antibiotics for asymptomaticuria or bacteriauria in immunocompetent, nonpregnant patients.

Utilize severity of illness and evidence-based scoring systems to determine which patients with pneumonia require broad-spectrum antibiotics.

Consider watch-and-wait (delayed) prescribing for uncomplicated infections.

Engage pharmacists in your culture follow-up process.

Rationale

The addition of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus coverage for uncomplicated, nonpurulent cellulitis does not reduce treatment failure rates. 1–6

Health care–associated pneumonia is no longer considered a valid paradigm; instead use clinical severity and/or the Drug Resistance in Pneumonia (DRIP) score to determine which pneumonia patients require broad-spectrum antibiotics. 17

This strategy has demonstrated dramatic reductions in antibiotic use for respiratory conditions (eg, otitis media). 18

Besides the benefit of reduced cognitive load for physicians in the emergency department, several studies indicate that pharmacist-driven culture follow-up results in significant improvements in antibiotic prescribing. 14,15

Table 1: Top 5 Tips to Improve Antibiotic Stewardship in the Emergency Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIP</th>
<th>RATIONALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoid “double coverage” for uncomplicated cellulitis.</td>
<td>The addition of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus coverage for uncomplicated, nonpurulent cellulitis does not reduce treatment failure rates. 1–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not use antibiotics for asymptomaticuria or bacteriauria in immunocompetent, nonpregnant patients.</td>
<td>Health care–associated pneumonia is no longer considered a valid paradigm; instead use clinical severity and/or the Drug Resistance in Pneumonia (DRIP) score to determine which pneumonia patients require broad-spectrum antibiotics. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize severity of illness and evidence-based scoring systems to determine which patients with pneumonia require broad-spectrum antibiotics.</td>
<td>This strategy has demonstrated dramatic reductions in antibiotic use for respiratory conditions (eg, otitis media). 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider watch-and-wait (delayed) prescribing for uncomplicated infections.</td>
<td>Besides the benefit of reduced cognitive load for physicians in the emergency department, several studies indicate that pharmacist-driven culture follow-up results in significant improvements in antibiotic prescribing. 14,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage pharmacists in your culture follow-up process.</td>
<td>The addition of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus coverage for uncomplicated, nonpurulent cellulitis does not reduce treatment failure rates. 1–6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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By ROBERT REDWOOD, MD, MPH, FACEP; LARISSA MAY, MD, MSPH, MSHS; AND MICHAEL PULIA, MD, MS, FACEP
As part of career advancement and professional requirements, we attend professional conferences. We use testing centers to take standardized exams, including the United States Medical Licensing Examination (USMLE) and specialty board certification exams. Although “tips” exist for lactating women who want to pump at national conferences, systemic challenges remain. Similarly, social media backlash for the lack of lactation support at testing centers has made it clear that there is extensive room—and need—for improvement. When breastfeeding women are not supported to pump and/or breastfeed at conferences and testing centers, they are forced to choose between professional opportunities and their personal and family health.

Like many women’s issues, this affects more people than is commonly appreciated. Women face challenges quite differently than their male counterparts. Women skipping conferences and thus losing out on opportunities and their personal and family health.

Forced to choose between professional opportunities and their personal and family health.

• Sanitizing wipes for surfaces in the pumping area and gloves to wear while cleaning up.
• Portable screens can create visual barriers as well as multiple private lactation stations within a larger room.
• Commercial options also exist for standing or sitting lactation stations (eg, Mamava).
• Offer nearby running hot water and soap for handwashing and cleaning pumping parts.
• Have cold storage space to store expressed milk during the conference day and either bagged ice or freezer space to protect ice packs for travel.

In addition to these basic accommodations, if feasible, it’s also helpful to provide:
• Storage space for individual breast pumps.
• Sanitizing wipes for surfaces in the pumping room and gloves to wear while cleaning up.
• Multi-user (hospital-grade) breast pump(s) that conference participants can use—these can be rented—with advertising about the type of pump in advance so participants can bring appropriate adapters.
• Information on conference hotels that can guarantee cold storage for guests.
• Breast milk donation. Facilitating expression and donation gives participants the option of shipping transport home. The American Academy of Pediatrics has a Donor Milk Drive toolkit available to those interested in organizing this.11

For estimating the amount of space required for lactation, organizers should ask regulators about their lactation needs. Estimating that women will use these spaces for 20–30 minutes every three to four hours, with disproportionate use during break time, a reasonable starting point would be to offer one lactation station for every four women who will need to pump during the event.

Breastfeeding at Conferences: Mothers With Infants On-Site

The best lactation support includes providing accommodations for mothers who prefer to bring their infants with them and breastfeed at conferences and other events. Very young infants are rarely disruptive, and conferences should allow them in sessions.

• Signs such as “Mothers With Breastfeeding Infants Are Welcome” or “Breastfeeding and/or Pumping Are Welcome Here” signal all participants to accept the mild disruption of hearing noises from infants or from pumps being used by women who are comfortable pumping in public (with subtle wearable pumps or covered traditional pumps).
• Remote viewing options, such as a separate room where the conference content is live-streamed, allow parents to step out or share child-care responsibility among multiple care providers.
• Advertising inclusion of young children and breastfeeding in addition to pumping will support all early parents, not just lactating women, during a time of early career development that is often overlooked.

Special Considerations for Testing Centers

No matter the specialty, becoming a licensed physician requires sitting for multi-hour examinations. Given that lactating women have a physiological need to express breast milk at least once or twice during a full-day examination, testing centers must follow for pumping as a matter of gender equity for all participants. This can be accomplished with the same rigor as other test accommodations.

• Timing: Lactating women need additional break time to allow for pumping (approximately 30 minutes every three to four hours). Test administrators can increase total available break time for all participants to maintain parity among test takers, and scheduling this will likely be utilized only by those who need to pump or have another extenuating reason.

• Administrative barriers: Currently, there are significant hurdles to being allowed to pump during testing. These should be removed. One example: In addition to a three-page application for obtaining extra break time during USMLE examinations, mothers who want to pump during the exam must submit, weeks ahead of time, photos of their personal equipment and a letter from their personal physician stating the medical necessity of pumping.2 For any lactating woman, pumping is a medical necessity. These barriers must be removed.

• Storage: Most testing centers are unlikely to be able to provide durable lactation stations with multi-user devices, making it critical to allow for the safe storage of personal breast pumps within the testing center. Regulations regarding in-center storage and a test taker’s access to their personal equipment need to be altered for lactating health professionals. In addition, testing centers should provide access to a refrigerator in which lactating women may store breast milk throughout their testing day(s).

Conclusion

Support for lactating women during clinical shifts has been a focus of gender equity in emergency medicine in recent years.12 Though there is still much to accomplish, it is critical to recognize that support for lactating professionals in other settings, including episodic events like standardized testing and medical conferences, is part of supporting the professional development of women in our field. The accommodations described here supplement several ways emergency medicine is moving to support work-family balance, including child care at medical conferences and family-friendly networking events. Parents with young families make up a considerable segment of our early career professional group. By showing support for lactating women and those with young children, we can all benefit from the inclusion of some of the most active members in our field.

For a more extensive discussion, please see our related article “Best Practices for Lactation Support at Conferences and Standardized Testing Centers” in Obstetrics & Gynecology. doi: 10.1097/OGO.0000000000005662.
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The State of Pulmonary Embolism (PE) Exclusion

Thankfully, we are continuing to make progress toward reducing the use of advanced imaging in the evaluation of PE. Two studies published in the past year illustrate potential strategies to address imaging overuse. The first looks at the use of the YEARS protocol for the evaluation of PE in pregnant women, using the combination of high risk features and two different D-dimer thresholds to increase the number of women who can safely conclude do not require imaging. While this prudent application of YEARS was shown to improve imaging stewardship, it also illuminated the regrettable over-triage of pregnant women to evaluation for PE and an underlying baseline culture of pervasive advanced imaging. Further useful work in this field may incorporate trimester-adjusted D-dimer in addition to further decision support.

A second study parallels the YEARS concept except it uses the Wells Score as the foundation, dividing the cohort into low-, intermediate-, and high-pretest likelihood for PE. The D-dimer Testing Tailored to Clinical Probability in Suspected Pulmonary Embolism (PEGed) study doubled the D-dimer imaging threshold cutoff for patients with a low-pretest likelihood, and no cases of missed PE were observed. While this is a successful demonstration of their strategy, considering clinical equipoise for PE allows a miss rate of around 1 percent to balance harms and benefits, even more aggressive strategies are likely reasonable. At least, this study still represents another important step further establishing pretest-adjusted D-dimers as appropriate.

Finally, the most concise update is from the realm of syncope. Several years ago, a systematic evaluation of hospitalized patients with syncope found a prevalence of PE of 16 percent. Now, another prospective study finds the prevalence of PE at presentation (which is mainly what we care about when making decisions about who to work up) to the emergency department to be much lower: only 5.4 percent in these data. An evaluation for PE is necessary only as otherwise clinically indicated in the context of syncope.

Post-Arrest Care

When patients present following cardiac arrest, a continuing controversy has been the utility of emergency coronary angiography. In patients presenting with suspected ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction, the clinical picture seems clear. In those presenting with non-diagnostic electrocardiographic findings, the observational evidence likewise seems to support intervention. However, the first randomized trial evidence is trickling out now, and the Coronary Angiography after Cardiac Arrest (COACT) study found no clear benefit. This is the first of what are likely to be many forthcoming study reports, but it is the highest-quality evidence we have to date.

Another recent study reports on the expansion of therapeutic hypothermia to those presenting to the emergency department after cardiac arrest with a nonshockable rhythm. The overall survival of this population is dissimilar, comparatively, with 90-day mortality of greater than 80 percent. The use of target-temperature management (TTM) in this population was observed to provide a small absolute advantage in neurologically intact survival, increasing the justification of using TTM in this population. However, deviations from TTM resulted in febrile episodes in the majority of patients out of hospital, but failure to prevent these episodes may have contributed to poorer outcomes and muddles the reliability of this trial’s observations. It may still be that the most critical thing we can do is to prevent fevers in these patients.

Sepsis Steps Forward and Backward

Despite abundant face validity to the observation that all patients suffering overwhelming infection are not the same, our sepsis protocols offer little room for reasonable variation. Researchers at the University of Pittsburgh finally provided some hard data to back up better differentiation of those presenting with sepsis, performing a complex analysis of cytokine and gene expression in response to infection. Their data show clear differing phenotypes among what we currently just call “sepsis,” with a wide range of mortality for each phenotype, as well as variable enrichment of clinical trials with the differing phenotypes. While their analysis does not provide any specifically actionable utility, this demonstration should help future research better tailor interventions to specific subgroups of sepsis patients.

Meanwhile, the Early Goal Directed Therapy Using a Physiological Holistic View (ANDROMEDA-SHOCK) investigators put the classic lactacid clearance target as a marker of sepsis treatment success to the test. In one arm of this study, patients were resuscitated per protocol as guided by serial lactacid measurements, or to clinical peripheral perfusion targets. In the other arm, investigators used glass slides and held manual pressure to the distal tips of patients’ fingers, then observed the length of time necessary for capillary perfusion to occur. At 24-hour follow-up, all-cause mortality was 8.4 percent in the lactacid clearance arm compared to 34.9 percent in those resuscitated to peripheral perfusion targets. The study was small enough that this difference in mortality could have occurred by chance alone, but it certainly provides a note of concern regarding even the most well-accepted practices underpinning our current approach to sepsis.

Lastly, we are beginning to receive the first trickle of results regarding the importance of high-dose vitamin repletion in sepsis. The Vitamin C Infusion for Treatment in Sepsis Induced Acute Lung Injury (CITRIS-ALI) trial started before much of the hullabaloo over vitamin C infusions, and potential treatment implications of novel clinical phenotypes for sepsis. N Engl J Med. 2019;380(12):1139-1149. A randomized clinical trial.

The opinions expressed herein are solely those of Dr. Radecki and do not necessarily reflect those of his employer or academic affiliations.
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VAPING-RELATED ILLNESS

by CARAL EDELBERG, CPC, CPMA, CAC, CCSP, CAC

A new ICD-10 diagnosis code for vaping-related illness (U07.0, vaping-related disorder) has been assigned due to the increase in vaping-related illness since 2017. The condition is termed “EVALI” for e-cigarette or vaping related lung illness, and the World Health Organization Family of International Classifications developed a temporary code for it effective for use starting Sept. 24, 2019. Additional code assignments are expected at the March 2020 ICD-10 Coordination and Maintenance Committee meeting.

Guidance suggests that all related signs, symptoms, and associated cannabis- and nicotine-related disorders should also be documented and coded. Toxic effects should be documented and identified with appropriate codes—for example, T40.7X1, poisoning by cannabis (derivatives), accidental (unintentional).

Documentation of any lung-related complications and substance use, abuse, and dependence requires a unique code to identify the condition accurately for payment purposes. Coding professionals should be advised to assign as many codes as appropriate to ensure recognition and payment for this problem (eg, cannabis-related disorders, nicotine-related disorders, and specifically for vaping of nicotine, F17.29). For patients who are diagnosed with EVALI, documentation should identify the specific condition such as bronchitis due to chemicals, pneumonitis due to inhalation of oils, acute respiratory distress syndrome, pulmonary eosinophilia, acute interstitial pneumonitis due to inhalation of oils, acute respiratory distress syndrome, pulmonary eosinophilia, abnormal weight loss, chills, etc.

The CDC coding guidelines for vaping can be found at www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/icd/Vapingcodingguidance2019_10_17_2019.pdf.

Stay tuned for updates following the March ICD-10 Coordination and Maintenance Committee meeting.

Brought to you by the ACEP Coding and Nomenclature Committee.

MS. EDELBERG is founder and chairman of Edelberg + Associates.
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initiation of patterns of hyperalgesia, abuse, and addiction; preventing harm to allow treatment access; and restoring normalcy to the lives left tattered through treatment initiatives. Recovery programs aim to provide long-term stability through social support systems or, more successfully, evidence-based medication-assisted treatment programs. However, the reality is that those with opioid use disorder are constantly at risk of overdose, whether due to a highly potent or adulterated illicit supply, loss of tolerance during abstinence or treatment, or an attempt to pursue the elusive “next best high.”

Naloxone is a drug with the ability to save lives in the hands of bystanders. But it is just one piece of the puzzle, and the long-term consequences of this public health initiative are still unknown. Additionally, the adverse effects have been understated and the benefits overstated. If we are to address this epidemic realistically, we need to be honest about the tools we have at our disposal. Naloxone is just the beginning of the answer to the opioid epidemic. We can manage precipitated opioid withdrawal and cannot resuscitate someone who has died, but real solutions to prevent death in those with opioid use disorder include expanding harm reduction efforts; implementing medication-assisted treatment programs;
Mind the Medicaid Gap

Medicaid expansion has helped patients and physicians in states that opted for it

by CEDRIC DARK, MD, MPH

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) has brought about massive changes to the structure of the American health care financing system. As a consequence, an additional 20 million Americans have coverage, and for the first time ever, the uninsured rate dove below 10 percent.1

For emergency physicians, the ACA has resulted in dramatic shifts in our pay-er mix, especially among the nonelder-ly adult population. While the ratios of emergency patients with Medicare have remained relatively stable over the past decade, there has been a slow but steady decline in private coverage. However, in 2013, when the ACA’s Medicaid expansion went into full effect, a dramatic shift in payer mix from uninsured to Medicaid became evident. This has been demonstrated in multiple studies of general emergency department patients, in states such as Illinois and Maryland, for young adults, and for trauma patients.2–8

What does this portend for our specialty? A few years ago, Jon Mark Hirshon, MD, PhD, MPhil, FACEP, the current Chair of the ACEP Board, co-authored a paper suggesting that this shift in payer mix from uninsured to Medicaid represented $3.97 additional revenue per RVU for the average emergency physician.3

The calculus for Medicaid expansion is crystal clear. The swath of preexisting data combined with a new paper, presented in this month’s EMRA+PolicyRx Health Policy Journal Club, builds upon what we should agree is an impeachable fact.

The ACA positively shifts payer mix for emergency care and ultimately leads to improved financial viability for our specialty.

Emergency physicians in the 14 states that have yet to expand Medicaid should strongly consider advocating for the 2.5 million Americans who remain stuck in the Medicaid gap.9–10
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ACA Expanded Coverage for Emergencies

by GREGORY JASANI, MD

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) sought to reduce the number of uninsured Americans. Advocates hoped that this would increase access to outpatient resources and potentially decrease ED utilization and inpatient admissions.

Researchers sought to determine if the ACA changed the number of uninsured patients visiting emergency departments and whether rates of inpatient admission fluctuated. They examined data from the National Hospital Ambulatory Care Survey and the Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project from the years 2006–2016. These dates allowed the authors to see trends both before and after the ACA was implemented.

The study found that while overall emergency department visits increased during the study period, the rates of uninsured patients visiting emergency departments decreased. During this time, the proportion of Medicaid patients visiting emergency departments increased. These trends were more pronounced after 2013, when many states expanded Medicaid. This effect was most pronounced among patients ages 18–64, who typically have the highest risk for being uninsured.

The data also showed that rates of admissions from the emergency department actually decreased after ACA implementation. Interestingly, this was not due to decreased emerg ency department utilization. In fact, the number of ED visits consistently increased during the study period. This study shows that more patients who visited the emergency department after ACA implementation were insured and that more of these patients were ultimately discharged home. The ACA has provided health coverage to more than 20 million Americans and has translated to higher rates of insured patients visiting emergency departments. This was also associated with lower inpatient admissions. Decreased admission rates could be due to expanded insurance leading to greater access to outpatient resources, obviating the need for inpatient admission. Yet the authors note that other factors, such as increasing use of observation services, may have also had an effect on this trend.

The ACA has greatly expanded health insurance coverage in the United States, changing the insurance status of our patients and possibly even increasing our willingness to discharge patients. As debates about the future of the ACA and other health policy issues continue, emergency physicians should remain engaged. This study shows that the outcome of these debates will influence the health and longevity of the patients we treat.
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Connecting patients to support programs; and being mindful of how powerful a compassionate, nonjudgmental, nonstigmatizing, and supportive system can be to the health of our patients.
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SEEKING EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT PHYSICIANS
The busiest ED in North Carolina, and one of the top 15 busiest in the nation, treats 95k adult and 35k pediatric cases annually in its 92 beds. We are currently seeking residency trained BC/BE emergency physicians to work in the 75 bed adult ED. This ED serves a high acuity patient population with 28% annual admission rate. There are over 90 hours of adult physician coverage daily and over 110 hours mid-level coverage daily. It is a Level III Trauma Center with robust hospitalist service, interventional cardiology, cardiac surgery, neurosurgery, etc. The facility is the Chest Pain and Stroke accredited. The EMS system is hospital owned and managed with an award winning paramedic program. Of note, the Pediatric ED is open and has 17 dedicated beds with an additional 24 hours of physician coverage and 20 hours of mid-level coverage. We welcomed our inaugural class of Emergency Medicine Residents in July 2017. Opportunities exist for both clinical and academic emergency physicians.

DR. LOZO is a medical student at Rutgers New Jersey Medical School in Newark, DR. NELSON is chair and professor in the department of emergency medicine at Rutgers New Jersey Medical School.

EXPECTED TO BE EXCITED AND CHALLENGED?
TOP TIER COMPENSATION
The cash compensation package is valued at over $250/hour, including evening, night, and holiday differentials, as well as a quarterly incentive bonus. We offer a generous sign-on bonus plus moving stipend. The comprehensive benefits package includes Malpractice Insurance Paid, CME Time and Allowance; 403(b) match and 457(b), and health, dental, and other desirable benefits.

THE AREA
Cape Fear Valley Health is located in the thriving and diverse community of Fayetteville, NC which consists of more than 319,000 residents. Fayetteville has received the prestigious All-America City Award three times from the National Civic League Group!

Known for its many golf courses (Pinehurst is located only 30 minutes away), our central location provides easy access to beautiful beaches to our east and to the majestic Blue Ridge Mountains to our west. Our mild climate, low cost of living, and patriotic spirit makes our location ideal for rising healthcare professionals and families.

www.aacepnow.com

ACEPNow.com
VICE CHAIR OF RESEARCH

The newly established Department of Emergency Medicine at Weill Cornell Medicine, led by Dr. Rahul Sharma, is seeking a highly motivated Vice Chair of Research at the Associate Professor or Professor level, preferably tenure track, to join the leadership team. The Vice Chair of Research position represents a major leadership appointment in the Department. The individual will report directly to the Department Chair and will provide leadership and oversight of the research mission for the Department. The Vice Chair must be visionary, demonstrate expertise in leading research in EM, and possess the ability to work across disciplines within a large, diverse organization.

The Department has a highly-dedicated faculty, including junior, mid-career, and senior members with a diverse mix of clinical, research and educational interests. The Vice Chair of Research will be expected to develop and lead research education and mentorship for faculty and residents. Successful candidates will have a demonstrated track record of independently funded research, publication in high-impact, peer-reviewed journals, strong mentorship skills and clear evidence of promoting the academic careers of junior faculty.

We offer a highly competitive salary, a generous support package to ensure the candidates transition and continued success, a comprehensive benefits package, and a generous retirement plan.

The Emergency Department at New York Presbyterian-Weill Cornell Medical Center serves as one of the major campuses of the fully accredited four-year New York Presbyterian Emergency Medicine Residency Program. Our Emergency Department is a high volume, high acuity regional trauma, burn and stroke center caring for more than 90,000 adult and pediatric patients. Faculty also have the opportunity to work at our New York Presbyterian-Lower Manhattan Hospital ED campus, which is a busy community hospital seeing 45,000 annual visits.

We offer programs in Telemedicine, Medical Toxicology, Geriatric Emergency Medicine, Wilderness Medicine, Global Emergency Medicine, Simulation and Ultrasound. In addition, we offer fellowships in Geriatric Emergency Medicine, Healthcare Leadership and Management, Pediatric Emergency Medicine as well as PA and NP residencies in Emergency Medicine.

Please submit a Curriculum Vitae and Cover Letter to the Chair of the Search Committee
SundayClark, MPH, ScD
emjobs@med.cornell.edu
emed.weill.cornell.edu

New York Presbyterian Hospital-Weill Cornell Medicine is an equal opportunity employer-Minorities/Women/Vets/Disabled encouraged to apply.
Penn State Health, Hershey PA, is expanding our health system. We offer multiple new positions for exceptional physicians eager to join our dynamic team of EM and PEM faculty treating patients at the only Level I Adult and Level I Pediatrics Trauma Center in Central Pennsylvania.

What We’re Offering:
- Salaries commensurate with qualifications
- Sign-on Bonus
- Relocation Assistance
- Retirement options, Penn State University Tuition Discount, and so much more!

What We’re Seeking:
- Emergency Medicine trained physicians with additional training in any of the following: Toxicology, Ultrasound, Geriatric Medicine, Pediatric Emergency Medicine, Research
- Completion of an accredited Emergency Medicine Residency Program and Fellowship for PEM positions
- BE/BC by ABEM or ABOEM
- Observation Medicine experience is a plus

What the Area Offers:
We welcome you to a community that emulates the values Milton Hershey instilled in a town that holds his name. Located in a safe family-friendly setting, Hershey, PA, our local neighborhoods boast a reasonable cost of living whether you prefer a more suburban setting or thriving city rich in theater, arts, and culture. Known as the home of the Hershey chocolate bar, Hershey’s community is rich in history and offers an abundant range of outdoor activities, arts, and diverse experiences. We’re conveniently located within a short distance to major cities such as Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, NYC, Baltimore, and Washington DC.

FOR MORE INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT:
Heather Peffley, PHR FASPR at: hpeffley@pennstatehealth.psu.edu
Looking for a clinical opportunity that helps reach your career goals while empowering you to deliver outstanding patient care?

Explore new clinical careers through SCP Health at scp-health.com/explore