As VT slowly but persistently works toward creation of a healthcare system that will cover all Vermonters and keep costs under control, two voices are often missing from the conversation: clinicians and consumers. Dr. Howard Brody threw down the gauntlet to physicians to step up to the plate in 2010 with his article in the *New England Journal of Medicine* (NEJM 362; 4 1/28/10) titled “Medicine's Ethical Responsibility for Health Care Reform—The Top Five List.” He has literally ignited an avalanche of research, policy commitments, and soul searching by physicians in multiple specialties, in medical schools, as well as in the popular media such as Gilbert Welch’s recent op/ed in the *New York Times* (“Testing What We Think We Know” on 8/19/12.)

VEN is fortunate to have Dr. Brody spend the day with us at our fall, statewide conference at Lake Morey Resort on September 19, 2012. Hopefully you’ve registered because this will be a day you won’t want to miss. To register and get more information about the event go to the VEN website at www.vtethicsnetwork.org.

In preparation, this small review of his game changing article will try to set the stage and encourage you to read in advance so we can have a rich, informed dialogue that will truly help our state move forward on this important topic that everyone is talking about. In people often ask, “What are the most common issues you encounter as an ethics consultant?” Since Dave Letterman has not asked this question recently in the “Top Ten List” segment of his show, we decided we might raise the question, addressing only five in this newsletter as no one has yet offered us a one-hour time slot on TV. Even so, these five are overlapping and interrelated.

1. In our experience at two teaching hospitals and from talking with those involved in ethics consultation in various hospital settings, the most common question raised is about limitation of treatment. Patients, families, and healthcare professionals often struggle to identify the goals of treatment at different times during the course of illness. Questions we might be asked to help clarify include: Should we continue the ventilator, or stop—or dialysis—or chemotherapy? Should we do another surgery, or attempt CPR? These questions are complex and require challenging conversations about a patient’s goals and values.

2. Closely related to question #1 is the question of non-beneficial treatment. This is the old “futility” bugaboo dressed up with a new name since resolution of that debate remains unsuccessful. It is of historical interest that a generation ago, these disagreements most often involved patients/families who wanted to stop and physicians who felt obligated to continue (recall the cases of Quinlan ’76 and Cruzan ’90). Currently, however, it is much more common for physicians to want to stop non-beneficial treatment before the patient or family is ready to change goals (Schiavo ’05).

3. Other uncertainty regularly prompting requests for ethics consultation are questions surrounding decision making capacity and surrogacy. Ideally, decisions are made by patients themselves, but illness can result in compromise to or loss of decision making capacity. It can be challenging to determine how much capacity a patient has, especially in critical situations. Even when there is agreement about the loss of capacity, who then speaks on the patient’s behalf? We had hoped this might be largely resolved through the use of Advance Directives, but (a) most adults have no documentation of advance care planning, and (b) even when this exists, the situations that actually arise very often do not fit those described in directives. So then we look to close family and friends for decisions, but (surprise!) there is frequent disagreement among these persons. More than 35 states have addressed this puzzle by legislating a hierarchical surrogate list. Giving legal decision-making authority to a specific individual might help in some situations, but all too often the “default” surrogate is not the person with the best information about the patient’s wishes.
addition to reading his original article, you could also read his next article (NEJM 366; 21 on 24 May 2012) titled “From an Ethics of Rationing to an Ethics of Waste Avoidance.” Here you’ll find a fascinating application of the ethical theory of futility. Check it out!

Dr. Brody has both an MD (in Family Practice) and a PhD in philosophy which he has used to study and write about bioethics for the past 30 years. He brings serious credentials to the table when he began to wonder in 2009: why are insurance companies offering to take a hit in the pocketbook to help reduce healthcare costs (and getting all the great PR that came with this)—only slightly offsetting the fact that many Americans have a pretty low opinion of them—and yet physicians said they would only reduce costs if their income was protected? Everyone loves their doctors (well, almost everyone) but would they love to see this? Does that mean my doc cares more about her income than whether I can’t come to see her because I can’t afford it? Is income more important than patients? Americans can easily believe the profit motive of insurance companies or drug companies, but this is a serious contradiction to what they think and know about their doctors. What’s wrong with this picture?

His mind really got creative when he saw research that showed significant geographic variations in the number of expensive procedures performed in one region of the US than in another, but where the outcomes in each region did not line up as would be expected. In other words, some areas had equally good or better health outcomes for the number of expensive interventions and another area did not fare so well. What’s that about? Could it mean that we could reduce the number of expensive interventions and protect or improve the health outcomes of our patients as well as reduce the cost of healthcare at the same time?

Putting these two things together, Dr. Brody was off and running. He wasn’t just wanting to call doctors to the ethical table to uphold their Hippocratic Oath of patients before everything (including income), but he had suggestions of how to do it. His article suggests that each specialty could pick the top five procedures which meet criteria like: evidence based medicine does not prove high expense; and more risks than benefits to the health of patients. Then they could recommend that these not be automatically prescribed. Wow! This totally struck a chord and the medical community was off and running to meet the challenge.

Dr. Brody’s article is brief but powerful. His critique is full of common sense but also supported by the best research available (or evidence of the lack thereof.) First the American Board of Internal Medicine Foundation (ABIM) revved up their Choosing Wisely campaign (www.ChoosingWisely.org) and so far more than 15 specialties (including oncology and cardiology) have signed on and identified their Top Five. Then Consumer Reports created their campaign (www.consumerhealthchoices.org) out of their Health Ratings Center. Their perspective was that consumers needed to be educated about these choices of interventions and truly partner with their doctors in deciding whether they wanted or needed them. The goal is for the doctor and patient together to know from evidence based medicine what the risks and benefits (including cost) are of a procedure before deciding to do it. Word spread like wildfire. Books like Overdiagnosed: Making People Sick in the Pursuit of Health by Welch, Schwartz, and Woloshin of Dartmouth hit the mainstream.

Then in July, 2012 the American College of Physicians put forth their curriculum for residents that added a seventh competency in order to practice medicine and it is called “The High Value, Cost-Conscious Care Curriculum” and flows from the seminal work of Dr. Brody plus Weinberger’s article “Providing High-Value, Cost-Conscious Care: A Critical Seventh General Competency for Physicians” in the Annals of Internal Medicine in 2011 (155:386-388.)

Suddenly the idea that doctors will be in the forefront of determining what healthcare is both necessary and economical has become a real player in the world of healthcare reform. How to keep our costs down so that everyone can be covered and practice good medicine is now a legitimate goal. The medical world has taken ethical leadership and we will all benefit. Thank you Dr. Brody for setting us on this path, and for coming to Vermont to help us put your knowledge and insights into practice.
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4 Many ethics consults are not really about ethical issues, but are rather about poor communication. Prognosis is an inexact science. Patients and families often feel confused because they hear different things from different members of the treatment team. Team members often have unique perspective related to their specialty, each individual with variable communication skills. Differences in language or culture may also unintentionally result in miscommunication. Unfortunately, many professionals are very reluctant to say, “I’m sorry, but your mother is not going to survive this illness,” instead saying “Things are not looking good” with the noble intent of not wanting to eliminate hope. We all have experience with hoping and planning for the best, but we are relatively inexperienced with planning for and communicating about the worst, especially in the compressed atmosphere of illness and suffering. Much of this confusion could be resolved with improved communication skills training and documentation in the chart, not only about one’s thinking, but also about what has been said to the patient and their family.

5 When seeking to identify a source for these issues, we encounter a common theme—diminished trust. The patient-physician relationship has historically been based on the premise that physicians can be trusted to promote well-being and alleviate pain and suffering. This is largely true today as well; however, several factors have contributed to erosion of trust at the margins. Such factors as: social mobility, specialization, and large group practices often lead to “stranger medicine”; the high cost of high-tech care encourages physicians to be good stewards of medical resources, but patients often interpret this as miserliness or even discrimination (again, often proposed by strangers).

We are sure ethics committee members can also expand on this list.
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