Correspondance

Nuts, omega-3s and food labels

It is misleading to suggest, as Erica Weir and associates¹ have done in a recent Public Health article, that nuts and seeds (other than flaxseed) are sources of omega-3 fatty acids. One hundred grams of the oil extracted from the most common nuts (peanut, coconut, almond, hazel, Brazil and cashew) would provide about 900 kcal of energy but no omega-3 fatty acids. Of the oils from these nuts, that of cashew has the highest omega-3 fatty acid content, at only 0.14 g/100 g.² The only nuts that are good sources of omega-3 fatty acid are walnut (10.4% of the oil)² and the almost-extinct butternut.

As a practical tip for Canadians, unhydrogenated canola oil is cheap and contains about 10% omega-3 fatty acid (α -linoleic acid) without an excessively high content of omega-6 fatty acid (linoleic acid).² Similarly, flaxseed oil, at 55% omega-3 fatty acid, may be used as a supplement.² Any oily fish contains the longer-chain omega-3 fatty acids eicosapentaenoic acid and docosahexaenoic acid, which lower triglycerides and have other health benefits.³

Arguably, the most successful secondary prevention trial for heart disease

was the Lyon Diet Heart Study,⁴ in which the only intervention was a daily dose of about 2 tablespoons (about 30 mL) of unhydrogenated canola oil in the form of a margarine. Omega-3 fatty acids are vitally important, and our new food labels should indeed help us to make informed choices.

Eddie Vos
Sutton, Que.

References

1. Weir E, Traynor M, Levin W. Nutrition labelling tidbits. *CMAJ* 2004;170(10):1538-9.
2. Search the USDA National Nutrient Database for Standard Reference, release 16-1 [online]. [place unknown]: USDA Nutrient Data Laboratory; 2004. Available: www.nal.usda.gov/fnic/foodcomp/search/ (accessed 2004 Aug 17).
3. Harris WS, Connor WE, Illingworth DR, Rothrock DW, Foster DM. Effects of fish oil on VLDL triglyceride kinetics in humans. *J Lipid Res* 1990;31(9):1549-58.
4. Leaf A. Dietary prevention of coronary heart disease. The Lyon Diet Heart Study [editorial]. *Circulation* 1999;99:733-5.

DOI:10.1503/cmaj.1040840

[One of the authors responds:]

We agree with Eddie Vos that the text of our article on nutrition labelling¹ mistakenly suggests that omega-3 fatty acids are found in "many fish, nuts, seeds and oils." The text should have stated that omega-3 fatty acids are found in "many fish and in

some nuts, seeds and oils." Table 1 in our article¹ places appropriate emphasis on the major food sources of omega-3 fatty acids, as does Vos's letter.

Erica Weir

Associate Medical Officer of Health
Kingston, Frontenac and Lennox &
Addington Health Unit
Kingston, Ont.

Reference

1. Weir E, Traynor M, Levin W. Nutrition labelling tidbits. *CMAJ* 2004;170(10):1538-9.

DOI:10.1503/cmaj.1041251

Canadian Adverse Events Study

Ross Baker and associates, in their study of adverse events (AEs) in Canadian hospitals,¹ used a method that has been used in other countries to characterize this problem, but we feel that this method underestimates the impact of adverse drug events in Canadian hospitals.

First, of the 18 predefined criteria used in stage 1 of the study, the occurrence of an adverse drug reaction was the only criterion used to screen for possible drug-related AEs. However, in the pharmaceutical care model estab-

lished by Hepler and Strand² and practised by many clinical pharmacists in the hospital setting, adverse drug reactions represent only 1 of 8 possible drug-related problems that might constitute an AE. Other drug-related problems, such as administering too much or too little of an indicated drug, administering the wrong drug and drug interactions, would not have been captured by the initial screening in the study by Baker and associates. As a result, the records of patients who experienced AEs secondary to medications but for reasons other than an adverse drug reaction would not have been reviewed in stage 2, and these data would not have been captured in the final analysis.

Second, AEs occurring in the emergency department were not evaluated in this study, despite the substantial impact of drug-related emergency visits.³ In a well-designed prospective trial, Tafreshi and colleagues⁴ estimated that 28% of all visits to the emergency department were drug-related, of which 70% were preventable. Omission from the Canadian Adverse Events Study of emergency patients — a heterogeneous patient population with acute medical problems — would also contribute to an underestimation of AEs. Given the issues of emergency department overcrowding and longer wait times in our country, AEs in this setting need further evaluation.⁵

Peter J. Zed

Richard S. Slavik

Vancouver General Hospital
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, BC

References

1. Baker GR, Norton PG, Flintoft V, Blais R, Brown A, Cox J, et al. The Canadian Adverse Events Study: the incidence of adverse events among hospital patients in Canada. *CMAJ* 2004; 170(11):1678-86.
2. Hepler CD, Strand LM. Opportunities and responsibilities in pharmaceutical care. *Am J Hosp Pharm* 1990;47:533-43.
3. Patel P, Zed PJ. Drug-related visits to the emergency department: How big is the problem? *Pharmacotherapy* 2002;22:915-23.
4. Tafreshi MJ, Melby MJ, Kaback KR, Nord TC. Medication-related visits to the emergency department: a prospective study. *Ann Pharmacother* 1999;33:1252-7.
5. Canadian Association of Emergency Physicians,

National Emergency Nurses Affiliation. Joint position statement on emergency department overcrowding. *Can J Emerg Med* 2001;3:82-4.

Competing interests: None declared.

DOI:10.1503/cmaj.1040919

To limit unnecessary anxiety among patients, careful attention should be given to certain details of the Canadian Adverse Events Study¹ that might be missed by someone reading the article quickly.

For example, AEs were reported for 7.5% of admissions, but nearly one-third of these occurred in the 12 months preceding the index admission. If these AEs are excluded, the risk of experiencing an AE in association with the hospital stay is closer to 5.2%.

For each identified AE, a single chart reviewer was asked to judge, on a 6-point scale, the likelihood that the event had been caused by health care management. The number of AEs reported was based not on the events for which management causation was considered “virtually certain” or even on those for which evidence of causation was “moderate to strong,” but rather on all events for which causation by management was judged more than 50% probable. This number must have included events about which the chart reviewer had considerable doubts.

Death, disability (temporary and permanent) and prolongation of hospital stay were pooled as a single outcome, which prevents readers from distinguishing between serious and more trivial events. For “most of the patients” who experienced an AE “their AEs contributed to longer stays in hospital or temporary disability,” but we are not told whether the extensions of hospital stay were a matter of hours, days or months.

For most health care professionals, who are already well aware that all procedures are associated with some risk, the outcome of greatest interest in this study is the rate of preventable AEs, estimated at 2.8% (or about 1.9% if the one-third of events that took place before the hospital stay are excluded). Using a chart review to determine which events were attributable to management and then

which of these were preventable must have been difficult in many cases. It is not surprising that for the 10% of charts that were reviewed by 2 physicians, there was “only moderate agreement . . . in assessing injury, preventability and the contribution of health care management to AEs” (kappa scores of 0.47, 0.69 and 0.45, respectively).

To help readers make up their own minds a brief description of the clinical details of each AE is available as an online appendix to the article.² However, perusal of this information raises more doubts. Thirty-nine events were judged to be “highly preventable” (meaning not that they were easy to prevent but that the evidence of preventability was considered “virtually certain”). However, in 11 cases, only the mismanagement is recorded, without mention of any resulting event. In 9 others the evidence of preventability is at least arguable, for example, in case 32, “hepatitis caused by lipid-lowering drugs in patient with chronic pancreatitis and familial hypercholesterolemia.” Even if this were an example of a lipid-lowering drug causing hepatitis, how else should a patient with familial hypercholesterolemia be treated? An AE following appropriate use of a necessary drug is surely not “preventable.”

This study should stimulate further efforts to diminish the frequency of preventable AEs associated with hospital stays, but careful reading of the methods and results is necessary to avoid overestimating the risk.

Maurice McGregor

McGill University Health Centre
Montréal, Que.

References

1. Baker GR, Norton PG, Flintoft V, Blais R, Brown A, Cox J, et al. The Canadian Adverse Events Study: the incidence of adverse events among hospital patients in Canada. *CMAJ* 2004; 170(11):1678-88.
2. Baker GR, Norton PG, Flintoft V, Blais R, Brown A, Cox J, et al. e-Appendix 3: Brief description of clinical details of adverse events occurring in 255 patients, by corresponding maximum degree of preventability. *CMAJ* 2004;170(11). Available: www.cmaj.ca/cgi/data/170/11/1678/DC3/1 (accessed 2004 Jul 5).

Competing interests: None declared.

DOI:10.1503/cmaj.1041078