

Canadian C-Spine Rule study for alert and stable trauma patients: I. Background and rationale

Ian G. Stiell, MD, MSc; George A. Wells, PhD; R. Douglas McKnight, MD; Robert Brison, MD, MPH; Howard Lesiuk, MD; Catherine M. Clement, RN; Mary A. Eisenhauer, MD; Gary H. Greenberg, MD; Iain MacPhail, MD, MHSc; Mark Reardon, MD; James Worthington, MB BS; Richard Verbeek, MD; Jonathan Dreyer, MD; Daniel Cass, MD; Michael Schull, MD, MSc; Laurie Morrison, MD; Brian Rowe, MD, MSc; Brian Holroyd, MD; Glen Bandiera, MD; Andreas Laupacis, MD, MSc; for the Canadian CT Head and C-Spine (CCC) Study Group

ABSTRACT

This paper is Part I of a 2-part series to describe the background and methodology for the Canadian C-Spine Rule study to develop a clinical decision rule for rational imaging in alert and stable trauma patients. Current use of radiography is inefficient and variable, in part because there has been a lack of evidence-based guidelines to assist emergency physicians. Clinical decision rules are research-based decision-making tools that incorporate 3 or more variables from the history, physical examination or simple tests. The Canadian CT Head and C-Spine (CCC) Study is a large collaborative effort to develop clinical decision rules for the use of CT head in minor head injury and for the use of cervical spine radiography in alert and stable trauma victims. Part I details the background and rationale for the development of the Canadian C-Spine Rule. Part II will describe in detail the objectives and methods of the Canadian C-Spine Rule study.

Key words: radiography, cervical spine injuries, decision rules

RÉSUMÉ

Il s'agit de la première partie d'un article en deux parties décrivant le contexte et la méthodologie de l'étude de la Règle canadienne concernant la colonne cervicale (Canadian C-Spine Rule study) visant à établir une règle de décision pour le recours rationnel à l'imagerie chez les victimes de traumatismes alertes et stables. Le recours actuel à la radiographie est inefficace et variable, en partie en raison d'un manque de lignes directrices fondées sur des données probantes pour guider les urgentologues. Les règles de décision clinique sont des outils de prise de décision fondés sur des recherches qui incorporent trois variables ou plus provenant des antécédents, de l'examen physique ou de simples tests. L'étude canadienne concernant les tomodensitogrammes de la tête et la colonne cervicale (Canadian CT Head and C-Spine Study) est un effort de collaboration sur une grande échelle visant à mettre sur pied des règles de décision clinique quant au recours au tomodensitogramme de la tête dans les cas de blessures mineures à la tête et à la radiographie de la colonne cervicale chez les victimes de traumatismes alertes et stables. La première partie décrit le contexte de la mise sur pied de la Règle canadienne concernant la colonne cervicale et sa justification. La deuxième partie décrira en détail les objectifs et méthodes de l'étude de cette Règle.

From the Division of Emergency Medicine, Department of Medicine, Department of Epidemiology and Community Medicine, Division of Neurosurgery and the Clinical Epidemiology Unit of the University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ont.; the Department of Emergency Medicine, Queen's University, Kingston, Ont.; the Divisions of Emergency Medicine, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alta.; the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont.; the University of Western Ontario, London, Ont.; and the University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC

Received: Aug. 23, 2001; final submission: Dec. 12, 2001; accepted: Dec. 12, 2001

This article has been peer reviewed.

Background

Cervical spine injuries

More than 1 million patients with neck injuries are seen annually in US emergency departments (EDs).^{1,2} Most have soft-tissue damage, but approximately 30 000 suffer cervical fractures or dislocations, and 10 000 suffer spinal cord injur.^{3–5} Canada has no readily available national ED data; however, based on extrapolation from US figures,^{1,2} we estimate that 410 000 motor vehicle collision (MVC) victims are seen annually in Canadian EDs. At the same time, Canadian emergency physicians see approximately 185 000 alert, stable adult trauma victims with potential neck injury.⁶ Of these, 0.9% have cervical spine (C-spine) fractures or dislocations.

Utilization of cervical spine radiography

Because of the potential for neurological injury, emergency care providers go to great lengths to protect the C-spine. Most trauma victims are transported to hospital with protective measures like a backboard, collar and sandbags — whether or not they have neck symptoms.^{5,7} Reports have suggested that clinical judgement is inadequate to predict significant injuries,^{8–10} and a recent survey found that 97% of 125 US trauma centres routinely ordered C-spine radiography for all trauma patients.¹¹ Canadian practice is more selective,⁶ but there is large variability among hospitals and physicians, and the use of C-spine radiography for alert, stable trauma patients remains inefficient. In Canada, about 110 000 alert stable trauma victims undergo C-spine radiography each year and in more than 98% of these examinations the findings are normal.⁶ There is a 2-fold variation in radiography rates among similar hospitals (37.0%–72.5%) and a 6-fold variation among emergency physicians (15.6%–91.5%). This variability persists even after controlling for differences in patient severity.

Less than 3% of trauma series have positive findings.^{7,9,12–22} Given the very low yield, many authors consider universal C-spine radiography inefficient.^{12–15,23–25} The huge number of normal radiographs adds to health care costs^{26,27} and to the burden of time and effort for ED staff. “Clearing the C-spine” often requires repeated imaging attempts, and this distracts physicians, nurses, orderlies and technicians from other responsibilities.²³

US EDs treat 4.1 million MVC victims annually¹ and charge from US\$90 to US\$230 for each patient having C-spine radiography. Total national ED charges for these studies are estimated at between US\$370 and US\$940 million. In Canada, more than \$30 million is spent annually

on outpatient C-spine radiography,²⁸ but it is unclear what proportion of this represents alert, stable trauma patients. What is clear is that the cumulative cost of high-volume procedures such as C-spine radiography is considerable and that these may contribute more to rising health care costs than expensive “high technology” tests.^{29,30} Guidelines that could lead to a modest reduction in the proportion of trauma patients undergoing C-spine radiography would produce a large savings in health care dollars.

Previous guidelines for cervical spine radiography

There is considerable controversy among emergency physicians, neurosurgeons and trauma surgeons regarding the indications for C-spine radiography. Some insist that all trauma patients should undergo imaging,^{3,8,21,31–33} and the American College of Surgeons’ Advanced Trauma Life Support course recommends that “cervical spine films be obtained on all patients with injuries above the clavicle — especially head injuries.”³³ Many trauma experts believe that a selective approach is preferable but do not provide clear recommendations.^{10,11,13,16,22,34–37} Most authors feel that radiography is unnecessary in alert patients with no neck pain or tenderness,^{5,7,9,12,14,18,23–25,38–45} but only a few are willing to suggest that imaging might be withheld in alert patients with pain but no midline bony tenderness.^{15,17,19}

Emergency practice is characterized by high case volumes, brief physician–patient contact, uncertain follow-up and fear of medicolegal repercussions.^{46–48} In such circumstances, physicians often fall into the widely advocated and inefficient approach of ordering C-spine radiographs for most or all trauma patients. Perhaps the greatest uncertainty surrounds alert patients with minimal symptoms and normal physical findings,¹⁵ who represent the largest group of blunt trauma patients and a huge potential for improved efficiency. But Canadian and US emergency physicians have differing views on this topic,^{49,50} and the consensus is that more research is necessary before C-spine radiography guidelines for alert trauma patients can be implemented.^{7,9,11,14,16,17,19,20,24,34,37–40,44} Future studies should be rigorous, prospective and involve large numbers of patients.

Evidence-based guidelines have improved radiographic utilization in patients with ankle and knee injuries, and there is a clear need for such guidelines in alert trauma patients with potential neck injury. These guidelines or decision rules must be very sensitive for detecting C-spine injuries and must not compromise care of trauma patients. Our research has shown that the majority of Canadian and US emergency physicians would adopt a sensitive and reliable decision rule for C-spine radiography.⁵⁰

Critical appraisal of previous studies

During the last 10 years, emergency physicians,^{7,9,14–16,19,36–38,40,45,49} trauma surgeons,^{3,5,10,12,13,20–22,39,44,51,52} and radiologists^{18,32} have attempted to identify subgroups of trauma patients who need not undergo C-spine radiography. We identified these studies by performing a MEDLINE database search (1966 to 1998; MeSH terms “spinal injuries” and “radiography”), an online search for “related articles,” a review of article bibliographies and a review of the investigators’ personal reference libraries. Unfortunately, although many studies have been published, they are highly variable in design, and none meet accepted methodological criteria for clinical decision rules (Table 1), as we discuss in the following critical appraisal.

The outcome measure for most studies was the presence of any radiographic fracture or dislocation; but different studies used different radiographic protocols, ranging from a single lateral view¹³ to 3 views^{10,18,19,21,32,44} to 5 views,^{9,15,16,36,40} and many gave no specific number of views.^{5,12,14,17,20,22,37–39,45,52} In most studies, outcome assessment was done in a unblinded fashion by investigators who were aware of the predictor variables. Only a few studies gathered data prospectively using data collection forms,^{9,10,15,17,19,40,44,45,52} no study described training the physicians to collect data in a standardized fashion, and no study explicitly collected the predictors without knowledge of the outcome. Only 1 study measured interobserver agreement to assess reliability.⁵³

Eligibility criteria have often been unclear in previous studies, making it difficult for readers to interpret and apply the findings to their own patients. Most studies lacked a standardized patient definition, enrolling any trauma pa-

tient who had C-spine films ordered at the treating physician’s discretion.^{5,9,16,18–22,40,44,45} Many included only patients with head or facial injury,^{10,12–15,36,51,52,54} documented C-spine fractures,^{3,32,38,39} high-risk injury mechanism,⁷ or the presence of neck pain.¹⁷ Some excluded patients with a decreased level of alertness,^{7,12,17,39,52} others deliberately included such patients,^{5,9,13,15,19,36,37,40} and the rest failed to specify level of alertness.^{3,10,14,16,18,20–22,32,38} Only 2 studies specified that subjects should be adults;^{14,15} the rest did not report age restrictions. Approximately half of all studies considered only admitted patients;^{3,7,12,13,21,22,32,36–39} the rest included all patients seen in the ED. Some studies excluded patients with penetrating injuries,^{12,14,15,19,22,36,40} and a few studies explicitly excluded intoxicated patients,^{12,13,39} patients with unstable vital signs,³⁶ those presenting more than 24 hours after the injury,¹⁷ and those transferred from other locations.⁴⁰ Most studies had fewer than 30 patients with abnormal radiographs^{7,9,10,12–19,36,40,52} and some studies had none.^{3,32,38,39} The statistical techniques used were generally rudimentary, and only 1 study performed a multivariate analysis.¹⁰ Few studies derived simple, clinically sensible guidelines. Only 3 assessed the accuracy of their recommendations by calculating sensitivity and specificity,^{10,19,40} only 1 attempted to prospectively validate their guidelines,⁴⁵ and none implemented their guidelines to determine their true impact on patient care.

The NEXUS criteria

Of particular note are the US-based NEXUS (National Emergency X-Radiography Utilization Study) criteria, which have received much attention after the publication of an impressive validation study incorporating more than

Table 1. Methodological standards for clinical decision rules

1. The **outcome** or diagnosis to be predicted must be clearly defined, and assessment should be made in a blinded fashion.
2. The clinical findings to be used as **predictors** must be clearly defined and standardized, and their assessment must be done without knowledge of the outcome.
3. The **reliability** or reproducibility of the predictor findings must be demonstrated.
4. The **study subjects** should be selected without bias and should represent a wide spectrum of characteristics to increase generalizability.
5. The **mathematical techniques** for deriving the rules must be identified.
6. Decision rules should be **clinically sensible**: have a clear purpose, be relevant, demonstrate content validity, be concise, and be easy to use in the intended clinical application.
7. The **accuracy** of the decision rule in classifying patients with (sensitivity) and without (specificity) the targeted outcome should be demonstrated.
8. **Prospective validation** on a new set of patients is an essential test of a new decision rule.
9. **Implementation** to demonstrate the true effect on patient care is the ultimate test of a decision rule; transportability can be tested at this stage.

34 000 patients.^{19,55,56} These guidelines state that no C-spine radiography is required if patients satisfy 5 low-risk criteria: absence of midline tenderness, normal level of alertness, no evidence of intoxication, no neurological findings, and no painful distracting injuries. However, while NEXUS is the largest relevant study to date, there are concerns about the specificity, reliability, and sensitivity of these criteria.

Specificity is a primary concern. The NEXUS criteria are only 12% specific; consequently, their adoption may lead to increased radiography utilization in most countries outside the US. In addition, clinicians may find that some of the criteria are poorly reproducible — particularly “presence of intoxication” and “distracting painful injuries.” We recently attempted a retrospective validation of the NEXUS criteria based on our database of 8924 patients and found that the criteria missed 10 of 148 clinically important injuries, yielding a sensitivity of only 93%.⁵⁷ We believe that these criteria should be further evaluated, prospectively and explicitly, for sensitivity, specificity and interobserver agreement in multiple sites before they can be accepted for widespread clinical use.

The Canadian CT Head and C-Spine (CCC) Study

Rationale for the CCC Study

Previous studies have been methodologically weak and inconclusive. Existing C-spine radiography guidelines for alert, stable trauma patients are contradictory or ambiguous, and the NEXUS criteria may have limited sensitivity and reproducibility. Furthermore, when the Canadian study was designed in 1994, the NEXUS criteria had not been validated. This study builds upon our previous research in which we derived, validated, and successfully implemented decision rules for ankle radiography (Ottawa Ankle Rule)^{47,58–65} and for knee radiography (Ottawa Knee Rule).^{66–70} An accurate, reliable, clinically sensible decision rule for C-spine radiography would permit physicians to provide more standardized and efficient care for trauma patients. Furthermore, physicians could be much more selective in their use of C-spine radiography without jeopardizing patient care. Such a decision rule should, therefore, lead to improved patient care and considerable savings for North American health care systems.^{65,69} We estimate that a 25% to 50% relative reduction in the use of C-spine radiography could be safely achieved with the Canadian C-Spine Rule.

Our preliminary studies clearly show that, although physicians in Canadian EDs are already selective, they

are also variable in their use of C-spine radiography for alert, stable trauma patients.^{6,49} An overwhelming majority of respondents to our survey stated that there is a need for better guidelines and that they would be very comfortable using an accurate, reliable decision rule for C-spine radiography in their own ED practice. Although many guidelines have had little influence on physician practice,⁷¹ we have demonstrated that accurate, reliable, clinically sensible decision rules, such as the Ottawa ankle and knee rules, have been readily implemented by many physicians and have led to a real change in clinical behaviour.^{62,64,70} We believe that a well-derived, validated, highly sensitive decision rule for the use of C-spine radiography would be widely adopted by emergency physicians and improve the quality and efficiency of patient care.

Preliminary work by the CCC Study Group

In 1994, we conducted a workshop that convened experts in emergency medicine, neurosurgery, research methodology and research coordination to discuss important methodological issues for the C-spine radiography project. In 1995, we conducted a pilot study that reviewed data from the EDs of 8 Canadian hospitals over a 12-month period.^{6,72} This study provided estimates of the number of eligible alert, stable trauma patients (6855), the referral rate for C-spine radiography (58.0%), the prevalence of acute C-spine injury (0.9%), the negative x-ray rate (98.5%), and the large x-ray utilization variability among similar sites (37.0%–72.5%) and among attending physicians (15.6%–91.5%). The analyses also showed, after controlling for injury severity by logistic regression analysis, that the variation in use of radiography was highly site specific.

We conducted 2 mail surveys to assess the attitudes of emergency physicians toward decision rules. In 1995, we surveyed 300 members of the Canadian Association of Emergency Physicians, with an 81% response rate.⁵⁰ Only 21.5% agreed with recommendations that all alert, stable trauma patients with high-risk mechanism of injury should have C-spine radiography, whereas 98% indicated they would consider using a sensitive and reliable clinical decision rule for the use of C-spine radiography. Not surprisingly, the physicians would require a higher sensitivity for a rule to predict clinically important fractures or dislocations (100%) than for a rule to predict any C-spine injury (median 96%). In 1998, we conducted mail surveys of 500 emergency physicians in Canada, the US, the UK, France and Spain.⁵⁰ The majority of them indicated strong support for a C-spine radiography decision rule.

Overview of the Canadian C-Spine Rule Study

The results of the phase I derivation component of the Canadian C-Spine Rule Study have been recently published.⁷³ In this phase, more than 200 emergency physicians at 10 Canadian teaching and community hospitals systematically evaluated 8924 alert and stable trauma patients for 20 clinical variables. Variables were evaluated for interobserver agreement and for univariate statistical

association with the primary outcome: clinically important C-spine injury. The strongest variables were further analyzed by multivariate recursive partitioning analysis to develop the final Canadian C-Spine Rule (Fig. 1). This decision rule was shown to be 100% sensitive for identifying the 151 clinically important injuries and would require that only 58.2% of alert, stable patients undergo C-spine radiography. The phase II prospective validation




Fig. 1. The Canadian C-Spine Rule for alert (Glasgow Coma Scale score = 15) and stable trauma patients where cervical spine injury is a concern

component of the study is now underway at 8 hospitals in Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia.

Conclusions

The use of C-spine radiography in alert, stable trauma patients is inefficient and highly variable. Previous studies in this area are limited by poor methodology and small sample size. The Canadian C-Spine Rule is a highly sensitive clinical prediction rule now being validated at several Canadian centres.

Competing interests: None declared.

Acknowledgements: This study was funded by peer-reviewed grants from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (MT-13700) and the Ontario Ministry of Health Emergency Health Services Committee (11996N).

Dr. Stiell is a Distinguished Investigator with the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Ottawa, Ont.

References

- McCaig LF. National Hospital Ambulatory Medical Care Survey: 1992 emergency department summary. *Advance Data* 1994;245:1-12.
- National Center for Health Statistics. National Hospital Ambulatory Medical Care Survey 1992. Hyattsville: National Center for Health Statistics, 1994.
- Reid DC, Henderson R, Saboe L, Miller JDR. Etiology and clinical course of missed spine fractures. *J Trauma* 1987;27:980-6.
- Diliberti T, Lindsey RW. Evaluation of the cervical spine in the emergency setting: Who does not need an x-ray? *Orthopedics* 1992;15:179-83.
- Bachulis BL, Long WB, Hynes GD, Johnson MC. Clinical indications for cervical spine radiographs in the traumatized patient. *Am J Surg* 1987;153:473-7.
- Stiell IG, Wells GA, Vandemheen K, Laupacis A, Brison R, Eisenhauer MA, et al. Variation in emergency department use of cervical spine radiography for alert, stable trauma patients. *CMAJ* 1997;156:1537-44.
- McNamara RM, Heine E, Esposito B. Cervical spine injury and radiography in alert, high-risk patients. *J Emerg Med* 1990;8:177-82.
- McKee TR, Tinkoff G, Rhodes M. Asymptomatic occult cervical spine fracture: case report and review of the literature. *J Trauma* 1990;30:623-6.
- Roberge RJ, Wears RC, Kelly M, Evans TC, Kenny MA, Daffner RD, et al. Selective application of cervical spine radiography in alert victims of blunt trauma: a prospective study. *J Trauma* 1988;28:784-8.
- Jacobs LM, Schwartz R. Prospective analysis of acute cervical spine injury: a methodology to predict injury. *Ann Emerg Med* 1986;15:44-9.
- Mirvis SE, Diaconis JN, Chirico PA, Reiner BI, Joslyn JN, Militello P. Protocol-driven radiologic evaluation of suspected cervical spine injury: efficacy study. *Radiology* 1989;170:831-4.
- Fischer RP. Cervical radiographic evaluation of alert patients following blunt trauma. *Ann Emerg Med* 1984;13:905-7.
- Gbaanador GBM, Fruin AH, Taylon C. Role of routine emergency cervical radiography in head trauma. *Am J Surg* 1986; 52:643-8.
- Bayless P, Ray VG. Incidence of cervical spine injuries in association with blunt head trauma. *Am J Emerg Med* 1989;7:139-42.
- Neifeld GL, Keene JG, Hevesy G, Leikin J, Proust A, Thisted RA. Cervical injury in head trauma. *J Emerg Med* 1988;6:203-7.
- Cadoux CG, White JD, Hedberg MC. High-yield roentgenographic criteria for cervical spine injuries. *Ann Emerg Med* 1987;16:738-42.
- McNamara RM, O'Brien MC, Davidheiser S. Post-traumatic neck pain: a prospective and follow-up study. *Ann Emerg Med* 1988;17:906-11.
- Kreipke DL, Gillespie KR, McCarthy MC, Mail JT, Lappas JC, Broadie TA. Reliability of indications for cervical spine films in trauma patients. *J Trauma* 1989;29:1438-9.
- Hoffman JR, Schriger DL, Mower W, Luo JS, Zucker M. Low-risk criteria for cervical-spine radiography in blunt trauma: a prospective study. *Ann Emerg Med* 1992;21:1454-60.
- Lindsey RW, Diliberti TC, Doherty BJ, Watson AB. Efficacy of radiographic evaluation of the cervical spine in emergency situations. *South Med J* 1993;86:1253-5.
- Davis JW, Phreaner DL, Hoyt DB, Mackersie RC. The etiology of missed cervical spine injuries. *J Trauma* 1993;34:342-6.
- Hills MW, Deane SA. Head injury and facial injury: Is there an increased risk of cervical spine injury? *J Trauma* 1993;34:549-54.
- Vandemark RM. Radiology of the cervical spine in trauma patients: practice pitfalls and recommendations for improving efficiency and communication. *AJR* 1990;155:465-72.
- Roberge RJ. Facilitating cervical spine radiography in blunt trauma. *Emerg Med Clin NA* 1991;9:733-42.
- Daffner RH. Cervical radiography in the emergency department: Who, when, how extensive? *J Emerg Med* 1993;11:619-20.
- Abrams HL. The "overutilization" of x-rays. *N Engl J Med* 1979;300:1213-6.
- Gleadhill DNS, Thomson JY, Simms P. Can more efficient use be made of x-ray examinations in the accident and emergency department? *Br Med J* 1987; 94:943-7.
- Ontario Ministry of Health. The Ontario statistical reporting system 1993-94. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Health; 1994.
- Moloney TW, Rogers DE. Medical technology: a different view of the contentious debate over costs. *N Engl J Med* 1979;301:1413-9.
- Angell M. Cost containment and the physician. *JAMA* 1985; 254:1203-7.
- Changaris DG. Cervical spine films, cost, and algorithms. *Am J Surg* 1987;153:478.
- Woodring JH, Lee C. Limitations of cervical radiography in the evaluation of acute cervical trauma. *J Trauma* 1993;34:32-9.
- Advanced Trauma Life Support Instructor Manual. 5 ed. Chicago: American College of Surgeons; 1993.
- Knopp RK. Evaluation of the cervical spine: unresolved issues. *Ann Emerg Med* 1987;16:819-20.
- Sumchai AP. Selective application of cervical spine radiography in alert victims of blunt trauma: a prospective study. *J Trauma* 1988; 28:1686-7.
- Frye G, Wolfe T, Knopp R, Lesperance R, Williams J. Intracranial hemorrhage as a predictor of occult cervical-spine fracture. *Ann Emerg Med* 1994;23:797-801.

37. Williams J, Jehle D, Cottingham E, Shufflebarger C. Head, facial, and clavicular trauma as a predictor of cervical-spine injury. *Ann Emerg Med* 1992; 21:719-22.
38. Ringenberg BJ, Fisher AK, Urdaneta LF, Midthun MA. Rational ordering of cervical spine radiographs following trauma. *Ann Emerg Med* 1988;17:792-6.
39. Saddison D, Vanek VW, Racanelli JL. Clinical indications for cervical spine radiographs in alert trauma patients. *Am Surg* 1991;57:366-9.
40. Roberge RJ, Wears RC. Evaluation of neck discomfort, neck tenderness, and neurologic deficits as indicators for radiography in blunt trauma victims. *J Emerg Med* 1992;10:539-4.
41. Roberge RJ. Cervical spine radiography after blunt trauma: Is it always needed? *Postgrad Med J* 1993;93:205-12.
42. Rosen P, Barkin RM, Danzl DF, Hockberger RS, Ling LJ, Markovchick V, et al. *Emergency medicine: concepts and clinical practice*. 4 ed. Toronto: CV Mosby Co; 1998.
43. Tintinalli JE, Kelen GD, Stapczynski JS. *Emergency medicine: a comprehensive study guide*. 5 ed. Toronto: McGraw-Hill, Inc.; 2000.
44. Roth BJ, Martin RR, Foley K, Barcia PJ, Kennedy P. Roentgenographic evaluation of the cervical spine: a selective approach. *Arch Surg* 1994;129:643-5.
45. Domeier RM, Evans RW, Swor RA, Frederiksen SM. Prospective validation of prehospital spinal clearance criteria. *Acad Emerg Med* 1995;2:355-6.
46. Feinstein AR. The "chagrin factor" and qualitative decision analysis. *Arch Intern Med* 1985;145:1257-9.
47. Stiell IG, McDowell I, Nair RC, Aeta H, Greenberg GH, McKnight RD, et al. Use of radiography in acute ankle injuries: physicians' attitudes and practice. *CMAJ* 1992;147:1671-8.
48. Long AE. Radiographic decision-making by the emergency physician. *Emerg Med Clin NA* 1985;3:437-46.
49. Tay SY, Thoo FL, Sitoh YY, Seow E, Wong HP. The Ottawa Ankle Rules in Asia: validating a clinical decision rule for requesting x-rays in twisting ankle and foot injuries. *J Emerg Med* 1999;17:945-7.
50. Graham ID, Stiell IG, Laupacis A, O'Connor AM, Wells GA. Emergency physicians' attitudes toward the use of clinical decision rules for radiography. *Acad Emerg Med* 1998;5:134-40.
51. Malomo AO, Shokunbi MT, Adeloye A. Evaluation of the use of plain cervical spine radiography in patients with head injury. *East Afr Med J* 1995;72:186-8.
52. Beirne JC, Butler PE, Brady FA. Cervical spine injuries in patients with facial fractures: a 1-year prospective study. *Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 1995;24:26-9.
53. Mahadevan S, Mower WR, Hoffman JR, Peeples N, Goldberg W, Sonner R. Interrater reliability of cervical spine injury criteria in patients with blunt trauma. *Ann Emerg Med* 1998;31:197-201.
54. Brand DA, Frazier WH, Kohlhepp WC, Shea KM, Hofer AM, Ecker MD et al. A protocol for selecting patients with injured extremities who need x-rays. *N Engl J Med* 1982;306:333-9.
55. Hoffman JR, Mower W, Wolfson AB, Todd K, Zucker M. Validity of a set of clinical criteria to rule out injury to the cervical spine in patients with blunt trauma. *N Engl J Med* 2000;343:94-9.
56. Hoffman JR, Wolfson AB, Todd K, Mower WR. Selective cervical spine radiography in blunt trauma: methodology of the National Emergency X-Radiography Utilization Study (NEXUS). *Ann Emerg Med* 1998;32:461-9.
57. Stiell IG, McKnight RD, Wells GA, Lesiuk H, Vandemheen K, Clement C, et al. Application of the NEXUS Low-Risk Criteria for cervical spine radiography in Canadian emergency departments. *Acad Emerg Med* 2000;7:566.
58. Carter A. Clinical practice guidelines. *CMAJ* 1992;147:1649-50.
59. Stiell IG. A study to develop clinical decision rules for the emergency department use of radiography in acute ankle injuries [thesis]. Ottawa: Univ. of Ottawa; 1991.
60. Stiell IG, Greenberg GH, McKnight RD, Nair RC, McDowell I, Worthington JR. A study to develop clinical decision rules for the use of radiography in acute ankle injuries. *Ann Emerg Med* 1992;21:384-90.
61. Stiell IG, Greenberg GH, McKnight RD, Nair RC, McDowell I, Reardon M, et al. Decision rules for the use of radiography in acute ankle injuries: refinement and prospective validation. *JAMA* 1993;269:1127-32.
62. Stiell IG, McKnight RD, Greenberg GH, McDowell I, Nair RC, Wells GA, et al. Implementation of the Ottawa Ankle Rules. *JAMA* 1994;271:827-32.
63. McDonald CJ. Guidelines you can follow and can trust: an ideal and an example. *JAMA* 1994;271:872-3.
64. Stiell IG, Wells G, Laupacis A, Brison R, Verbeek R, Vandemheen K, et al. A multicentre trial to introduce clinical decision rules for the use of radiography in acute ankle injuries. *Br Med J* 1995;311:594-7.
65. Anis AH, Stiell IG, Stewart DG, Laupacis A. Cost-effectiveness analysis of the Ottawa Ankle Rules. *Ann Emerg Med* 1995;26:422-8.
66. Stiell IG, Wells GA, McDowell I, Greenberg GH, McKnight RD, Cwinn AA, et al. Use of radiography in acute knee injuries: need for clinical decision rules. *Acad Emerg Med* 1995;2:966-73.
67. Stiell IG, Greenberg GH, Wells GA, McKnight RD, Cwinn AA, Cacciotti T, et al. Derivation of a decision rule for the use of radiography in acute knee injuries. *Ann Emerg Med* 1995;26:405-13.
68. Stiell IG, Greenberg GH, Wells GA, McDowell I, Cwinn AA, Smith NA, et al. Prospective validation of a decision rule for the use of radiography in acute knee injuries. *JAMA* 1996;275:611-5.
69. Nichol G, Stiell IG, Wells GA, Cacciotti TF, McDowell I, Laupacis A. Cost-benefit analysis of implementation of the Ottawa Knee Rule. *Acad Emerg Med* 1997;4:433.
70. Stiell IG, Wells GA, Hoag RA, Sivilotti MLA, Cacciotti TF, Verbeek RP, et al. Implementation of the Ottawa Knee Rule for the use of radiography in acute knee injuries. *JAMA* 1997;278:2075-8.
71. Greco PJ, Eisenberg JM. Changing physicians' practices. *N Engl J Med* 1993;329:1271-4.
72. *Guide to Canadian Healthcare Facilities*. Ottawa: Canadian Healthcare Association; 1995.
73. Stiell IG, Wells GA, Vandemheen K, Clement C, Lesiuk H, De Maio VJ, et al. The Canadian Cervical Spine Radiography Rule for alert and stable trauma patients. *JAMA* 2001;286:1841-8.

Correspondence to: Dr. Ian G. Stiell, Clinical Epidemiology Unit, F6, Ottawa Health Research Institute, 1053 Carling Ave., Ottawa ON K1Y 4E9; 613 798-5555 x18688, fax 613 761-5351, istiell@ohri.ca