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A goal of “zero”

I have practised emergency medicine for 41 years. For the past 31 years I worked full time, exclusively doing 12-hour night shifts at Dartmouth General Hospital in Nova Scotia. I am 70 years old, soon to be 71 years old. My unrestricted licence to practise medicine in Nova Scotia came into effect 9 hours after I graduated in 1967.

My goal has always been “zero”—that is, to have zero new patients waiting in the emergency department (ED) at least once during my 12-hour night shift. I am almost always successful in reaching this goal, and for the past 3 months I have always reached it.

Having zero patients, even if it happens momentarily, is a great morale booster for all ED staff. They can then concentrate on the patients already in the ED and see new patients in a timely fashion. If all the staff on a shift have zero patients as their goal (as well as good care, of course), it happens—at least that’s been my experience, no matter how bad things look at the start of a shift. Getting to zero patients is becoming more challenging as time goes by, because the patients are sicker and the “quickies” are now a very small minority of the ED patient population.

I think that zero patients is a good 24/7 goal for all ED staff to have. In the daytime, practising zero might at least decrease the wait time, and perhaps prevent the night staff from starting “behind the eight ball.”

To practise zero, there has to be less gabbing, and staff should not bring their new house plans to the ED to get everyone’s opinion. (I’ve seen it happen.) If there is a congregation of staff having a “gab fest” when there is much work to be done, simply walk by and say “I’m glad we had this little talk.” It works every time—the congregation quickly disbands.

Just a few “zero” thoughts.

—Michael Hebb MD CCFP(EM) DABEM
Dartmouth, NS
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Opioids versus nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs in noncancer pain

In Lynch and Fischer’s comparison1 of our research on opioid-related mortality2 with previous research on the safety of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs),3 they imply that opioids are safer than NSAIDs.

We have shown that the opioid-related mortality rate among public drug plan beneficiaries who are prescribed opioids for noncancer pain is 1.86 per 1000 (95% CI 1.64 to 2.10 per 1000) within 2 years and 7.92 per 1000 among the small proportion of patients who are prescribed more than 200 mg of morphine or equivalent per year.4 The all-cause mortality rate among patients prescribed opioids for noncancer pain is approximately 1% per year—roughly 5 times higher than in patients who are not prescribed opioids.

The opioid-related mortality rate of 27.2 per 100,0004 reported in our study and cited by Lynch and Fischer is a population-level statistic that includes all Ontarians in the denominator, not just those prescribed opioids. It is incorrect and misleading to contrast this with the rate of NSAID-related mortality in patients who are treated with NSAIDs.

Only a well-designed randomized trial would definitively assess the relative safety of opioids and NSAIDs. No such study exists, and we must therefore look to observational studies for the best available evidence. In a high-quality cohort study, Solomon et al recently showed that older adults who were prescribed opioids were almost twice as likely to die as patients prescribed NSAIDs were.5

Based on these data as well as our own, we believe it is reasonable to conclude that, as currently used in clinical practice, opioids are more dangerous than NSAIDs. This finding is consistent with recommendations from the World Health Organization that acetaminophen and NSAIDs be used before opioids.5

—Irfan A. Dhalla MD MSC FRCP
Toronto, Ont
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