

Correspondance

life-threatening conditions. However, we do not feel that such treatment is appropriate in self-limiting conditions where it is of dubious benefit (e.g., in cases of poison ivy).

Our goal is not to “embolden lawyers” or increase the number of lawsuits. Rather, we are attempting to alert physicians to what we feel is strong presumptive evidence that some association exists between short-course steroid therapy and the development of avascular necrosis. There is much more to learn regarding this condition, and our series does not provide conclusive proof that there is a cause–effect relationship between the two. However, avascular necrosis is a crippling condition in young adults and the distressing number of cases that we have seen, and continue to see, following the use of steroid medication stimulated this report.

Michael D. McKee

Division of Orthopaedics
Department of Surgery
St. Michael's Hospital
Toronto, Ont.

James P. Waddell

Division of Orthopaedics
Department of Surgery
St. Michael's Hospital
Toronto, Ont.

Patricia A. Kudo

Division of Orthopaedics
Department of Surgery
St. Michael's Hospital
Toronto, Ont.

Emil H. Schemitsch

Division of Orthopaedics
Department of Surgery
St. Michael's Hospital
Toronto, Ont.

Robin R. Richards

Division of Orthopaedics
Department of Surgery
St. Michael's Hospital
Toronto, Ont.

References

1. Louie BE, McKee MD, Richards RR, Mahoney JL, Waddell JP, Beaton DE, et al. Treatment of osteonecrosis of the femoral head by free vascularized fibular grafting: an analysis of surgical outcome and patient health status. *Can J Surg* 1999;42(4):274–81.
2. McKee MD, Waddell JP, Kudo PA, Schemitsch EH, Richards RR. Osteonecrosis of the femoral head in men following short-course corticosteroid therapy: a report of 15 cases. *CMAJ* 2001; 164(2):205–6.

The ethics of anonymous chart reviews

Although the approach used by Jacques Lemelin and colleagues to measure the effectiveness of a multifaceted intervention to improve preventive care in family practices in Ontario¹ may be methodologically valid, it raises important ethical questions.

Each of the 40 family practitioners in the study provided informed consent to participate, but it appears that repeated chart audits were done by various research personnel without the knowledge of any of the 4000 patients in the trial. In what seems to be an about-face, when telephone interviews were conducted with 1150 of these patients, all were asked for informed consent. Fifty-two (4.3%) of them refused to be interviewed. Why did the family physicians and researchers feel that they had the right to share patients' confidential files without consent as long as the patients did not know about it, but that consent was needed when the patients were to learn about the use of their medical charts for research purposes? Were the patients who were contacted for the telephone interviews told that their charts were being reviewed by strangers and were they given the option to refuse to have their charts used?

Although the study protocol was approved by the Ottawa Civic Hospital Ethics Review Board, we are left wondering whether researchers should obtain explicit consent from patients before they access patient-identifying data. Was the decision not to obtain patient consent made because the logistic difficulties associated with obtaining consent might have compromised the external validity of the study? Do the distinctive features of cluster randomized trials entail new ethical principles, or careful application of existing principles? If a physician gives consent to have his or her behaviour measured in such a trial does this transcend the right of patients to privacy?

Although we agree that outcome measurement is challenging, we feel

uneasy about the achievement of research goals at the expense of patients' rights. Our letter should not be interpreted as a personal criticism of Lemelin and colleagues but as an invitation to an open discussion about the issue of obtaining consent in primary care, health services and public health research.

Janusz Kaczorowski

Assistant Professor
Departments of Family Medicine and
Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ont.

John Sellors

Professor
Departments of Family Medicine and
Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ont.

Reference

1. Lemelin J, Hogg W, Baskerville N. Evidence to action: a tailored multifaceted approach to changing family physician practice patterns and improving preventive care. *CMAJ* 2001;164(6): 757–63.

[The authors respond:]

Janusz Kaczorowski and John Sellors question the ethics of an anonymous chart review. Their concern seems to be the apparent inconsistency in our approach to obtaining consent: we obtained consent from physicians to participate in the study and from patients before their telephone interview but we did not obtain consent for patient chart reviews.¹ Our approach is entirely consistent with the *Tri-Council Policy Statement on Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*, which states that researchers must obtain consent for physician participation in studies and for patient telephone interviews but not for chart reviews.² Section 3, paragraph C, states that “secondary use of data refers to the use in research of data contained in records collected for a purpose other than the research itself. Common examples are patient or school records or biological specimens, originally produced for therapeutic or educational purposes, but now proposed for use in research. The issue be-

comes of concern only when data can be linked to individuals ... in the published reports."²

The College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario regularly performs chart audits in physicians' offices in an effort to ensure quality of care and patient safety. Hospitals are not only permitted but are obliged to perform chart audits to ensure quality of care and continuous quality improvement. Physicians are encouraged by their professional associations to carry out chart reviews on their practices. In none of these scenarios is patient consent requested.

Our study was designed to determine whether an outreach facilitation would improve the provision of evidence-based preventive care in family practice. We ensured that no data could be linked back to the 4600 patients in 46 practices whose charts were audited. Chart audit with feedback to the physician is a very effective way to change physician practice patterns. Requiring patient consent for anonymous chart audits would be expensive and complex. It would have a negative impact on the science from a societal perspective, and it is not clear what gain

would be afforded in terms of patients' rights.

Rules on research ethics are designed to protect patients from harm. If these rules are to be changed, we should ensure that the changes would benefit patients and do no harm.

Jacques Lemelin

Associate Professor
Department of Family Medicine
University of Ottawa
Ottawa, Ont.

William Hogg

Professor
Department of Family Medicine
University of Ottawa
Ottawa, Ont.

Bruce Baskerville

Assistant Professor
Department of Family Medicine
University of Ottawa
Ottawa, Ont.

Raphael Saginur

Chair
Research Ethics Board
Ottawa Hospital — Civic Campus
Ottawa, Ont.

References

1. Lemelin J, Hogg W, Baskerville N. Evidence to action: a tailored multifaceted approach to changing family physician practice patterns and

improving preventive care. *CMAJ* 2001;164(6):757-63.

2. Medical Research Council, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, and Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. Tri-council policy statement: ethical conduct for research involving humans. Available: www.nserc.ca/programs/ethics/english/policy.htm (accessed 2001 July 19).

Corrections

Gloria Kay's maiden name was incorrectly given as Barton in a recent article.¹ Her maiden name is Barwell.

Reference

1. Capping off an era. *CMAJ* 2001;164(8):1190-1.

A recent article stated incorrectly that *Aspergillus* contamination had been documented at 24 Canadian hospitals.¹ In fact, it has been documented at 24 North American hospitals. Health Canada says only 2 Canadian hospitals have had a problem with nosocomial infection related to *Aspergillus* contamination.

Reference

1. Pinker S. ORs closed after *Aspergillus* discovered at Royal Vic. *CMAJ* 2001;164(9):1333.

Submitting letters

Letters may be submitted via our Web site or by mail, courier, email (pubs@cma.ca) or fax. They should be no more than 250 words long and must be signed by all authors. A signed copy of letters submitted by email must be sent subsequently to *CMAJ* by fax or regular mail. Letters written in response to an article published in *CMAJ* must be submitted within 2 months of the article's publication date. *CMAJ* corresponds only with the authors of accepted letters. Letters are subject to editing and abridgement.

eLetters

We encourage readers to submit letters to the editor via the eLetters service on our Web site (www.cma.ca/cmaj). Our aim is to post by the next business day correspondence that contributes significantly to the topic under discussion. eLetters will be appended to the article in question in *eCMAJ* and will also be considered for print publication in *CMAJ*. Beginning with the Aug. 22, 2000, issue, eLetters can be submitted by clicking on the mailbox icon at the end of the HTML text of any *eCMAJ* article.