spectively (these values refer to the maximal differences seen within 15 minutes of induction). Mean change in heart rate was (+) 4.2 beats/min, and in oxygen saturation, (+) 0.7%. Sedation and muscle relaxation were adequate, intubations were achieved without complication, and no adverse effects were recorded (muscular activity, seizures, dysrhythmias, bronchospasm, nausea or vomiting, pain on injection, thrombophlebitis, infections or clinical multiple organ dysfunction/adrenal insufficiency).

These results are in keeping with other published data on etomidate use for ED RSI.[1–4] Etomidate provides good intubation conditions and some neuroprotective effects with a low incidence of adverse hemodynamic effects. Of the induction agents on the market, it seems to offer "the best balance of utility and safety."[5] We encourage Canadian emergency physicians to expand their experience with this agent for optimal results in most ED intubations. Those interested in applying for etomidate use or in contributing to our prospective registry are invited to contact the authors.

J.E. Chirgwin, MD
Emergency Department
St. Mary's Hospital Center
Montreal, Que.
mdcn@total.net
C. Croteau, MD
Departement d'urgence
Centre Hospitalier du Sacre-Coeur
Montreal, Que.
christian.croteau@sympatico.ca

References

1. Schenarts CL, Burton JH, Riker R. Adrenocortical dysfunction following etomidate induction in emergency department patients. Acad Emerg Med 2001;8:1-7.
2. Sokolove PE, Price DD, Okada P. The Safety of etomidate for emergency rapid sequence intubation of pediatric patients. Pediatr Emerg Care 2000;16(1):18-21.
3. Smith DC, Bergen JM, Smithline H, Kirschner R. A trial of etomidate for rapid sequence intubation in the emergency department. J Emerg Med 2000;18(1):13-6.
4. Plewa MC, King R, Johnson D, Adams D, Engoren M. Etomidate use during emergency intubation of trauma patients. Am J Emerg Med 1997;15(1):98-100.
5. Schneider RE. Sedatives and induction agents. In: Walls RM, et al, editors. Manual of emergency airway management. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2000. p. 132.

Prehospital vs. ED pronouncement of death

To the editor:

I read with interest the article by Cheung and colleagues.[1] I believe a significant cost omission was made in the analysis of the costs involved in field pronouncement.

I work as coroner in Windsor, Ontario, a city and county that has been deemed by various reports of the Ministry of Health as underserviced to the tune of 50 general practitioners and 50 specialists. Often I am called to *certify* a death that has been pronounced in the field, either because the deceased has no physician or because the family physician cannot be reached (answering machine indicates to go to the ED or a walk-in clinic) or is unwilling to go to the scene in a timely fashion. In these instances funeral homes will not come to get the body without a death certificate being on the scene.

The cost of a coroner's investigation to the Ministry of the Solicitor General is $155 plus mileage. If the coroner is concerned about the circumstances of the death, an autopsy may be ordered. This necessitates transfer of the body to the nearest morgue (not by an ambulance doing field pronouncement but by a body removal service) ($89), then an autopsy (pathologist's fee: ~$400), not to mention the hidden institutional costs to the ministry for morgue attendants and facility fees.

Finally, there is the time involved in notifying the family of the autopsy results and answering their questions about their loved one's demise. Although this is covered in the $155 fee, it takes time and energy and, for most coroners who are busy family physicians, takes time away from their practices.

Studies into the cost benefits of field pronouncement that make statements such as: "Pronouncement in the field requires more paramedic time but less physician time" (p. 19) and "This study suggests an economic advantage for field vs. ED pronouncement" (p. 24) need to take the above facts into consideration before suggesting a significant saving to the system.

Jim Gall, MD
Coroner, Essex County, Ontario
Chair, Education Committee
Ontario Coroner's Association

Reference

1. Cheung M, Morrison L, Verbeek PR. Prehospital vs. emergency department pronouncement of death: a cost analysis. CJEM 2001;3(1):19-25.

[The authors respond:]

Dr. Gall has identified an important cost associated with field pronouncement that was not measured in this study. We chose a priori to exclude the cost attributed to the coroner's investigation, mileage, body removal and autopsy for specific reasons.

The patients in the ED pronouncement cohort were cared for in an institution that routinely contacts the coroner for all ED pronouncements. Thus, the cost of the coroner's investigation was the same for each group. Body removal by the coroner's office and autopsy are both at the discretion of the coroner and were similar for the two comparative groups. Body removal by a funeral home was presumed to be the same for both groups. The coroner's

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1481803500005479 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mileage to the out-of-hospital setting relative to the hospital was not taken into account because the impact of this difference was assumed to be negligible. Subsequent to the study period, the regional coroner's office emphasized the need for emergency physicians to complete the death certificate and to call the coroner's office only when the death met certain criteria. Presumably, this would reduce the cost of the coroner's investigation for each in-hospital ED pronouncement. However, requests for additional responsibility and more paperwork must be weighed against competing service and academic demands, and the routine practice of calling the coroner has not significantly changed.

Dr. Gall identifies an important factor that may limit the generalizability of our results to other regions as alluded to in the limitation section of the manuscript. We thank the Editor for the opportunity to respond and to Dr. Gall for his cogent comments and his interest in this subject.

Matthew Cheung, MD
University of Toronto
Laurie Morrison, MD
P. Richard Verbeek, MD
Prehospital Research Program
Department of Emergency Services
Sunnybrook & Women's College
Health Sciences Centre, and
Department of Medicine
University of Toronto, and
Toronto Emergency Medical Services
Toronto, Ont.

Pine Lake Tornado: the rural response

To the editor:

We read with interest the Pine Lake Disaster article by Sookram and colleagues[1] in the January issue of *CJEM*. Having been involved in the disaster response we feel it important to comment. Certainly, learning from such disasters will improve preparedness for future events, but accurate information about the response and the experiences of those directly involved are essential. Having read the article, we are not sure that this occurred.

The article discusses the value of physicians at the scene and indicates, correctly, that there was a STARS flight physician on site. In our opinion he should be praised for his actions in managing and triaging patients for transfer. The article also states that, within 2 hours, Edmonton emergency physicians were on site, but this observation diverges from our own experience.

In the aftermath of the tornado, Guardian Ambulance, the primary EMS responders to the event, rapidly contacted Innisfail Hospital (which normally covers the Pine Lake area), and requested a physician presence. In response, we left for the scene approximately an hour after the tornado touched down. After arriving, the only physicians we encountered were the STARS physician and one other physician, who arrived later in the evening. Despite being part of the tornado response, neither of us have been approached for any comment on the events of the day. The question is, if input from physicians and support staff both at the scene and at smaller regional hospitals was not solicited, can meaningful conclusions be drawn from limited reports of what occurred?

On a personal note, and reflecting our desire for accurate reporting of the event, we are concerned that the *CJEM* article focuses on the response of and the care provided by secondary and tertiary hospitals. Whilst most of the severely injured patients were correctly sent to centres with the facilities to cope with them, a large number were sent to Innisfail and other primary care hospitals. The lack of acknowledgement of the role played by these other hospitals and care providers is a cause of upset to many of the people involved.

Given that many disasters occur in areas remote from large urban hospitals, it seems that the rural and primary care disaster response should surely be of interest, yet it seems our contributions are not considered to the same degree as those of the larger centres. We do not want to belittle the efforts of anyone involved, and it was heartening to see how so many people came together to deal with the tornado, but we do have concerns about the way the disaster response was portrayed, and we would be interested in the authors' response to these concerns.

E. Barker, MB BS
R. Jarvis, MD
Innisfail Health Care Centre
Innisfail, Alta.

Reference

1. Sookram S, Borkent H, Powell G, Hogarth WD, Shepherd L. Tornado at Pine Lake, Alberta — July 14, 2000. Assessment of the emergency medicine response to a disaster. CJEM 2001;3(1):34-7.

[One of the authors responds:]

Thank you for reading and responding to our article. It was an unfortunate oversight that we did not solicit your input since, clearly, your perspective would have been valuable. As you suggest, Guardian Ambulance and the other early responders did a wonderful job establishing a triage station and recruiting help from the later-responding services. Health centres, rural hospitals and caregivers from Olds, Innisfail, Stettler, Three Hills, Lacombe and other small communities performed well during the night and made invaluable contributions to the disaster response.

An earlier draft of the article contained a more extensive discussion of the role of smaller communities. Unfortunately, for reasons of space, and perhaps because of our own more urban

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1481803500005479 Published online by Cambridge University Press