Guidelines for specialist training in cardiology

Sir—I strongly endorse the view of your editorial1 that the publication of guidelines for the training of cardiologists2 should be welcomed. These guidelines suggest that competence at temporary cardiac pacing should be established during the first 5 years of higher professional training and that a minimum of 25 procedures be performed. This recognizes the fact that temporary cardiac pacing can be technically difficult and that serious complications sometimes arise.

In practice, however, temporary pacing is a procedure that is learned by senior house officers (SHOs) undergoing general professional training. In a recent survey, 81% had learned temporary cardiac pacing at SHO level and teaching was provided primarily by medical registrars and fellow SHOs.3 A median of two procedures had been performed under supervision before the SHO was left to perform temporary cardiac pacing unsupervised.

Problems and complications with temporary cardiac pacing are frequent.4 This partly reflects the inexperience of junior medical staff who largely provide this service.5 The primary aim in providing guidelines for specialist training in cardiology must be to provide a better-cardiological service, through raising the standards of individual trainees. The problems with temporary cardiac pacing will not be addressed by this approach.

Training in temporary cardiac pacing must form part of general professional training and the British Cardiac Society should press the Royal College of Physicians to establish guidelines. The “see one, do one, teach one” approach to invasive procedures is no longer acceptable. Formal training could be provided within tutorials, by using training videos or mannequins, and a minimum number of procedures performed under supervision should be specified. Without this approach, the complications of temporary transvenous cardiac pacing will remain unacceptably high.

R M BOYLE
Secretary SAC in Cardiology, Department of Cardiology, York District Hospital, Wigginton Road, York YO3 7HE

Training in cardiology: the future

Sir,—Dr Boyle and his colleagues on the Specialist Advisory Committee in Cardiovascular Medicine of the Royal College of Physicians are to be thanked for their efforts at initiating guidelines for specialist training in cardiology. I did note with interest that in basic training the trainees are told that they must have basic knowledge of the physics of ultrasound and radionuclide imaging, yet no similar requirement is made for the physics and technical aspects of angiography. Perhaps the need was too obvious to state? Nevertheless I find that many cardiology trainees have a poor appreciation of x-ray technology, yet are training in the discipline that arguably delivers a greater radiation dose than many other types of imaging. The guidelines refer to the need for individuals to have a certificate of attendance at a course of radiation protection, but it must be pointed out that such a certificate is not adequate for an investigator who is performing angiography and that the legislation on radiation in medicine does require adequate training in equipment techniques. This advice is very nicely summarised in a recent pamphlet from the Department of Health (Health Service Use of Ionising Radiation HS(95/3)), which should be read by anyone performing cardiac catheterisation.

I hate to add to the burden of knowledge that a trainee must assimilate but perhaps the time has come to recognise the amount of radiation that is employed by cardiological investigations and to institute some element of formal training in x-ray hardware for the cardiological trainee. I am sure there are many of us who would be only too pleased to participate in this effort.

J J MURPHY
Memorial Hospital, Holyhead Road, Darlington, Co Durham, DL3 6JX
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This letter was shown to the authors, one of whom replies as follows:

Sir,—I read with interest the suggestion from Dr Partridge that there should have been a greater emphasis on the physics and technical aspects of angiography in the guidelines for training in cardiology. It had been assumed that this physics required would be addressed during courses on radiation protection. It is accepted that cardiologists in training should understand the technical aspects of any equipment used in their control, particularly equipment that is expensive and potentially hazardous. A contribution on this topic would be welcome when the guidelines are revised.

R M BOYLE
Department of Cardiology, York District Hospital, Wigginton Road, York YO3 7HE

Warm blood cardioplegia

Sir,—We read with interest the commentary by Youhana on warm blood cardioplegia6 and would like to clarify some of the issues that were raised.

Youhana implies that continuous normothermic blood cardioplegia (CNBC) has unanimously been shown to be superior to standard hypothermic techniques. Though Lichtenstein et al showed that mortality was reduced when CNBC was used in patients with long cross clamp times7 and after recent myocardial infarction,8 others found no difference in mortality between warm or cold cardioplegic techniques in patients undergoing urgent or emergency revascularisation.9 Furthermore, many of these studies are flawed by the use of retrospective controls to represent the hypothermic groups. The largest randomised study to date compared warm and cold cardioplegic techniques in 1732 patients and showed no significant difference in mortality or the incidence of non-fatal Q wave infarction between the groups.10 The authors, we suggest that currently there is no convincing evidence that overall clinical outcome is improved by the use of CNBC.

The commentary fails to address the important issue of adequate delivery of cardioplegia when warm techniques are used for myocardial protection. Evidence from experimental models11 suggests that efficient delivery of cardioplegia may be far more important than the temperature of the solution used. In pigs antegrade warm blood cardioplegia resulted in reduced regional and global left ventricular function and increased necrosis compared with retrograde after left anterior descending artery occlusion and reperfusion.12 Therefore, surgeons using cold blood cardioplegia can take comfort in the knowledge that they do not compromise myocardial protection by using a technique employing intermittent periods of ischaemia, those who advocate warm blood cardioplegic techniques must beware of inadequate delivery of cardioplegia in the face of coronary vascular disease.

J B PARTRIDGE
Harrifield Hospital, Harfield, Middlesbrough, UB9 6HJ

This letter was shown to the authors, one of whom replies as follows:

Sir,—I read with interest the commentary from Youhana suggesting that continuous normothermic blood cardioplegia (CNBC) may be the procedure of choice in the face of coronary and cerebrovascular disease. However, as you point out, it is important to ensure adequate delivery of cardioplegia when using cold techniques. It is in this regard that I will make my comments. The ischaemia time of 25–30 minutes during which NBCP is delivered is probably more important than the cold technique used. The sequence of NBCP should be performed in the following order: (1) Cardiac arrest: Insertion of a two lumen 14 gauge arterial line and cannula; (2) NBCP Delivery: Delivery of NBCP by gravity; (3) Cardiac reperfusion: Slow rewarming of the aorta to 37°C using the return flow of NBCP; (4) Myocardial reperfusion: If the myocardium was protected during aortic cross clamping, then the following sequence can be used: (a) Withdrawal of NBCP. (b) Reopening of the aorta and the return flow of NBCP; (c) Administration of cold cross clamping solution. Whichever technique is used, it is important to give adequate NBCP, which should be defined as: (a) For acute anterior wall myocardial infarction: at least 25 minutes of NBCP; (b) For left anterior descending occlusion: at least 45 minutes of NBCP; (c) For other acute myocardial infarction: at least 30 minutes of NBCP.

J B PARTRIDGE
Harrifield Hospital, Harfield, Middlesbrough, UB9 6HJ
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