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CLIMATE CHANGE

Politicians must heed health effects of climate change

The report on climate change and health commissioned by University College London and the Lancet concludes: “Climate change is the biggest global health threat of the 21st century.”1 In this report, the authors emphasise not only the immediacy and gravity of this threat but also the directness: while the poorest in the world will be the first affected, none will be spared. The escalating carbon footprint of the developed world has led to the present situation, but the rapid impact on developing countries such as the encroaching deserts in Africa is the immediate price.

This is one reason why doctors must take a lead in speaking out. Another is that there are important co-benefits of tackling climate change for those with long term conditions in the developed world, such as those that come from more exercise with less use of cars and dietary change with reduced meat consumption. In December this year, world governments meet in Copenhagen, Denmark, to negotiate a new UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. There is a real danger that politicians will be indecisive, especially in such turbulent economic times as these. Should their response be weak, the results for international health could be catastrophic.

Doctors are still seen as respected and independent, largely trusted by their patients and the societies in which they practise. As leaders of physicians across many countries, we call on doctors to demand that their politicians listen to the clear facts that have been identified in relation to climate change and act now to implement strategies that will benefit the health of communities worldwide.

This letter is published simultaneously in the Lancet.
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NHS organisations, let’s all sign up to the 10:10 campaign

We have joined the 10:10 campaign to cut our carbon dioxide emissions by at least 10% during 2010.1 The business reasons for joining are compelling:

• We must reduce our dependence on oil, with its fluctuating and increasing prices, if we are to deliver high quality care in the medium and long term
• Commitment to 10:10 is a positive investment in all our futures, benefitting staff morale, recruitment, and retention and increasing patients’ engagement with their health service
• Legislation and regulation such as the UK government’s carbon reduction commitment will increasingly penalise organisations that do not take bold steps to cut their emissions and become more environmentally sustainable
• Cutting energy costs is one way to increase the NHS’s productivity and efficiency.

The social reasons are equally compelling:

• With its responsibility to care for the health of the population, the NHS should reduce its contribution to climate change, “the biggest global health threat of the 21st century”2

• If we are serious about tackling health inequalities we should be taking bolder action on climate change, which already hits the poorest hardest

• As the largest organisation in the UK, the largest employer in Europe, and one of the largest employers in the world, the NHS must demonstrate leadership at this critical time. If we can deliver a 10% cut in our emissions in 2010 so can other organisations worldwide.

The 10:10 campaign takes positive, exemplary, and inspiring action on climate change (www.1010uk.org, health@1010uk.org). Early commitment to 10:10 can influence the climate change talks in Copenhagen in December of this year and make urgent cuts in global emissions a reality. We urge you to join and be part of the solution, so that we can all reap the rewards of a low carbon health service.
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ASSISTED DYING DEBATE

A baroness replies

Delamonthe is right about one thing: we should not equate disability with terminal illness.1 Not all disabled people are terminally ill, though many terminally ill people are disabled by their illness. The vulnerability of disabled people to collateral harm from the legalisation of assisted dying depends on the impact of their illness, their degree of dependence on others, and the
beliefs of some that their lives are less worth living. Many disabled people are more vulnerable than most, as Delamothe seems to recognise, albeit somewhat grudgingly.

The strident campaign to legalise assisted suicide for the terminally ill is being built around someone who is disabled and chronically rather than terminally ill. Many disabled people are like this. Therefore it is not surprising that they are concerned about the underlying message: if you have a disabling and degenerative illness the way should be cleared for you to have assisted suicide.

One hopes that the supporters of an assisted dying law would see it as providing a narrowly defined facility to be exercised under wholly exceptional circumstances. Simply limiting it to “terminally ill adults of sound mind who want to die” is not nearly sufficient to meet this requirement.

I argued in the *Lancet* article that Delamothe cites that if assisted dying is being justified on grounds of personal choice and control rather than unrelievable suffering, it has effectively lost its link with terminal illness and is therefore more open to drift to encompass people who are not terminally ill. Delamothe underestimates the pressures that a change in the law would place on disabled people.

Ilora G Finlay professor of palliative medicine, Cardiff University and Velindre NHS Trust, Cardiff CF14 2TL finlay@parliament.uk
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Doctors’ attitudes surveyed

Delamothe argues that it is “time for a carefully worded secret ballot” of UK doctors, having reported that 79% of the general public in a Harris poll believe in a “right to die” for the terminally ill.1

The need to clarify medical views on this subject was the motivation for my recently published survey of a large representative sample of UK doctors.2 I used the same questions as those used in surveys of the general public in British social attitudes surveys, which, like the Harris poll, have shown substantial public support for the legalisation of assisted dying.

The survey showed that the majority of UK doctors are opposed to the legalisation of euthanasia or physician-assisted dying, whether in cases of terminal illness or not. There are some variations between different groups of doctors, the most significant being whether a doctor is religious. Doctors specialising in palliative medicine are the most opposed, with doctors specialising in care of the elderly being the next most opposed.

These findings are consistent with studies comparing medical and public opinion in several other countries.

Clive Seale professor of medical sociology, Barts and the London School of Medicine and Dentistry, Queen Mary University of London, London E1 2AR c.seale@qmul.ac.uk
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Life is a terminal condition

Lord Carlile’s views are well known,1,2 but many can envisage differing thresholds and circumstances that are worse than death and not restricted to terminal illness. Since life itself is a terminal condition, there is a refreshing sense of realism in the possibility under Swiss law of assisted suicide in cases of unbearable suffering that is not the result of a terminal illness.

The attack on the World Trade Centre evidently led to some people committing suicide by jumping from the windows rather than suffer prolonged injury and death from the fire. Following these terrible circumstances, some people with religious convictions found comfort in knowing that the death of a relative had arisen from the unfolding alternatives rather than a deliberate act of suicide.3 In the current and different context should one be constrained to the alternatives for the religious reasons of others, or by the concerns of those who would not commit suicide given similar disabilities whether terminal or not?

Traditionally a doctor’s prime responsibility has been towards an individual patient, while not entirely neglecting wider considerations. Surely this should have resonance in how society responds, particularly when that patient, having reached a personal threshold, is seeking control over what remains of life and the departure from life.

The risk of exploitation is given prominence by those opposed to changes in the law, but these views seem to be detached from the everyday clinical reality of cases that are likely to occur.

If approached carefully and with consultation with other professionals and relatives these cases could be dealt with sensitively and appropriately—and more safely.

Malcolm Bowker retired consultant psychiatrist, Cheshire

Malcolm.bowker@add.com

Competing interests: MB is a subscriber to Dignity in Dying
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3 Channel 4. The falling man. 16 March 2006.
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Doctors, steer entirely clear

Cumberlege urges doctors to steer clear of assisted suicide and preserve their place in society as a profession with a clear purpose: to treat, cure, and care for sick and disabled people (to which I would add “and improve the health of the population”).1

If this is the right position for the medical profession, surely it also follows that since this position is based on professional self interest, society and the media should pay no attention whatsoever to our views on assisted suicide.

The medical profession would do well not just to steer clear of assisted suicide but to make it clear that it is not for us to influence the opinion of society at large.

If assisted suicide were ever to become legal then the position of the medical profession should be to have nothing to do with it. Yet that does not mean that society cannot press ahead and find another professional group to help with implementation.

Let us not just steer clear. Let’s steer entirely clear, routinely stating that this subject is very clearly outside our remit.

Christopher Spencer Jones director of public health, NHS South Birmingham, Birmingham B13 8JL Christopher.spencer-jones@dyary.com

Competing interests: None declared.
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END OF LIFE DECISIONS

Authors respond to editorial

In the editorial accompanying our study, Byock says that we focus on practices that rarely occur at the end of life, such as euthanasia and physician assisted suicide, and pay little attention to more common decisions.1,2 However, detailed empirical reporting is necessary because of the intense societal, legal, and ethical debates about these decisions. Additionally, although some decisions such as life ending drug use without explicit patient request and palliative sedation are not common in palliative care overall, they are more common than outside palliative care.
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HERPES ZOSTER OPHTHALMICUS

Don't forget HIV

Lam and colleagues did not mention possible HIV infection in their 10-minute consultation on herpes zoster ophthalmicus.1 Herpes zoster may occur at any stage of HIV infection and be its first clinical presentation. In one study it was significantly higher among HIV positive men than HIV negative men (29.4 v 2.0 per 1000 person years),2 and the risk of developing herpes zoster was not associated with duration of HIV infection or rapid progression to AIDS.

HIV infection should always be considered in patients under 65 with herpes zoster. Awareness of herpes zoster in HIV may help to reduce the incidence of people presenting late with HIV infection (M Sethupathi et al, BASHH-ASTDA conference, New York, May 2008).

Kathir Yoganathan consultant physician, Singleton Hospital, ABNI University NHS Trust, Swansea SAI2 8QA. kathir.yoganathan@swanseaswales.nhs.uk
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A/H1N1 FLU PANDEMIC

Roche responds

The use of oseltamivir (Tamiflu) in children and the development of resistance from widespread usage have been much debated.1

Antiviral treatments are currently the only available therapeutic option to prevent and treat infection with the A/H1N1 flu virus. The product summary for oseltamivir shows that it is effective and well tolerated in children.

The European Medicines Agency approves oseltamivir to treat and prevent flu in those aged 1 year and over on the basis of a positive benefit and risk assessment. The product summary for oseltamivir shows that it is effective and well tolerated in children.2

The World Health Organization recommends antiviral medicines should be restricted to patients identified as having pandemic A/H1N1.1 The protocol for their use should be guided by antiviral susceptibility results and the local and national guidelines of healthcare organisations.

Although information on various symptoms in proved A/H1N1 flu is lacking, the total absence of cough, coryza, or sore throat implies that an alternative diagnosis is worth considering, and the protocol should be modified to reflect patients with novel influenza A (H1N1) virus infection and their close contacts. May 2009.


Cite this as: BMJ 2009;339:b3758

Should flu have at least one respiratory symptom?

The algorithms for A/H1N1 flu currently used by the UK population do not seem to need any respiratory symptoms.1 Although information on various symptoms in proved A/H1N1 flu is lacking, the total absence of cough, coryza, or sore throat implies that an alternative diagnosis is worth considering, and the protocol should be modified to reflect patients with novel influenza A (H1N1) virus infection and their close contacts. May 2009.
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MESOTHELIOMA PATIENT JOURNEY

Researching the small things that matter

Two general practitioner academics who spent their professional lives researching the patient experience are facing terminal illness.1 Sweeney’s comment that “the more junior ranks of ancillary health professionals are simply unable to conceal the pleasure of the deployment of their authority” deserves to be systematically researched.

Managing serious illness requires collaboration between multiple professionals and, importantly, non-professionals.3 Seemingly small things—an ill-chosen phrase, lack of eye contact, a gaping hospital gown, and misinformation about the diagnosis—came together to erode Sweeney’s sense of dignity and his trust in the wider system of care.1

We should revisit the work of Garfinkel to develop a research agenda into the small things that matter.4 Much research on organisational work focuses on standard operating procedures. Garfinkel, in contrast, argued that work is irrediculously situated and contingent; medical work is characterised by a high degree of exceptionality; and the key research question is how, from moment to moment, staff attend to subtle cues from the patient, other staff, and the medical record, and adapt their actions and utterances accordingly.

My team showed that low status general practice staff such as receptionists have enormous power to shape organisational routines to provide interpreters for people with limited English.5 The difference between a good and disastrous patient experience was linked to such things as identity, mindfulness, and autonomy in the most junior members of the organisation. The agenda raised by our dying colleagues demands more theory driven research studies into how frontline administrative and ancillary work supports, or undermines, the high ideals of patient centred medicine.

Trisha Greenhalgh professor of primary health care, University College London trisha.greenhalgh@ucl.ac.uk

Competing interests: None declared.

2 McPherson A. An extremely interesting time to die. BMJ 2009;339:b2862. (14 August.)

Cite this as: BMJ 2009;339:b3749