

on at least two occasions.<sup>1</sup> Fewer patients, however, expressed a similar view.

This whole process would naturally involve a substantial amount of time and highlights the fact that obtaining consent is not an isolated event but rather a continuing dialogue.

Their study also raises other issues, particularly when obtaining consent in the arena of endoscopy, and the practicalities of doing so in a busy and demanding NHS practice. When discussing risks, how much is enough? Mayberry's study would suggest that 16% of clinical negligence solicitors and only 6% of patients would like to be informed of risks up to one in a million.<sup>1</sup> It is worth noting here that the risk of sustaining a serious injury while driving a car is only 1 in 5,000. Perhaps we should adapt the view of our colleagues across the water and discuss every risk no matter how small. There is still a problem of where to draw the line. The recent National Colonoscopy Audit carried out jointly by the British Society of Gastroenterology, the Royal College of Physicians and the Royal College of Surgeons has shown, for example, the perforation rate for a diagnostic colonoscopy was 1:1,000 and that for a therapeutic procedure 1:500. The consequences of a perforation may involve a laparotomy and perhaps a stoma. Should we mention this at the outset when obtaining consent?

What should we tell patients about who performs the procedure? In an accredited endoscopy unit there will usually be a trainee and, in most units now, a trained nurse endoscopist. Should the patient be given the choice as to who performs the procedure? Mayberry has also alluded to performance statistics and local disclosure panels. Thus, the patient probably has the right to know what the individual endoscopist's terminal ileal intubation rates and complication rates are, for example; or should they only be disclosed when asked specifically? The implications of this are enormous, needless to say. Furthermore, with the advent of the Cancer Plan and the two-week wait, there has been a surge in the workload and hence the formation of a one-stop colorectal clinic. Here the patient is assessed clinically and then a flexible sigmoidoscopy is performed followed by a barium enema on the same day. In such

cases, patients do not have time to contemplate the procedures beforehand and physicians cannot assess recall or understanding.

Finally, who should actually obtain consent? Should it be the physician/surgeon performing the procedure itself or the individual initiating the test? Often they are not the same. Or perhaps it should be nurse specialists, in their ever evolving role?

I believe wholeheartedly in the principle of involving the patient from the outset of the consultation and moving towards informed decisions, but we have still far to

go in putting this into practice. If patient care is to be improved, these issues should be addressed within the individual departments and trusts.

## References

- 1 MK Mayberry, JF Mayberry. Towards better informed consent in endoscopy: a study of information and consent process in gastroscopy and flexible sigmoidoscopy. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2001;13:1–10.

RP ARASARADNAM

Specialist Registrar Gastroenterology/Medicine  
Sheffield Teaching Hospitals, Sheffield

## Clinical & Scientific letters

Letters not directly related to articles published in *Clinical Medicine* and presenting unpublished original data should be submitted for publication in this section. Clinical and scientific letters should not exceed 500 words and may include one table and up to five references.

### Rate control in atrial fibrillation

Atrial fibrillation (AF) is the most common sustained tachyarrhythmia encountered in clinical practice.<sup>1</sup> Its prevalence increases with age and it is associated with a doubling of overall morbidity and mortality from cardiovascular disease.<sup>1</sup>

Three strategies form the basis of AF management: restoration and maintenance of sinus rhythm, rate control and prevention of stroke. Randomised trials have provided strong evidence of a substantial reduction in stroke with warfarin (target INR of 2.0–3.0).<sup>1</sup> Clinical factors associated with an increased risk for stroke include age  $\geq 65$  years, congestive cardiac failure, diabetes mellitus, previous stroke or transient ischaemic attack and hypertension.<sup>1</sup> For patients in persistent AF, until recently there were few clinical data available directly comparing a rate versus rhythm control strategy.

However, in four recent trials (PIAF,<sup>2</sup> RACE,<sup>3</sup> AFFIRM,<sup>4</sup> and STAF-Pilot<sup>5</sup>) patients in persistent AF were randomly allocated to rate versus rhythm control treatment. The results provide compelling evidence that rate control is as good as a

rhythm control strategy in terms of improvement in symptoms, quality of life, and mortality, and may be an acceptable and preferred first-line treatment for the majority of patients with persistent AF, who have a high risk of recurrence. Several other important messages emerged from these trials:

- the importance of maintaining long-term therapeutic anticoagulation even if sinus rhythm is quickly restored
- the poor efficacy of current rhythm control strategies, with a high cross-over rate from the rhythm to rate control strategy
- rhythm control strategies are associated with higher hospitalisation rates and more frequent adverse drug effects.

Having accepted that rate control is the appropriate strategy for most persistent AF patients, clinicians need clear guidance on what is considered acceptable ventricular rate control. Control of the resting heart rate does not automatically imply adequate heart rate regulation during exercise. The American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association/ European Society of

Cardiology (ACC/AHA/ESC) Task Force report<sup>1</sup> on AF stated that the ventricular rate is considered controlled when the rate ranges between 60 and 80 bpm at rest, and between 90 and 115 bpm with moderate exercise. Data from the recent rate versus rhythm control trials confirm that in clinical practice the ACC/AHA/ECS criteria for adequate ventricular rate control are achievable in the majority of patients. Exercise-related ventricular rate control can be assessed by either 24-hour holter monitoring or a six-minute corridor walk test.

## References

- 1 Fuster V, Ryden LE, Asinger RW, Cannom DS *et al.* ACC/AHA/ESC guidelines for the management of patients with atrial fibrillation. A report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines and the European Society of Cardiology Committee for Practice Guidelines and Policy Conferences (Committee to develop guidelines for the management of patients with atrial fibrillation) developed in collaboration with the North American Society of Pacing and electrophysiology. *Eur Heart J* 2001;**22**(20):1852–923.
- 2 Hohnloser SH, Kuck KH, Lilienthal J. Rhythm or rate control in atrial fibrillation-Pharmacological Intervention in Atrial Fibrillation (PIAF): a randomised trial. *Lancet* 2000;**356**(9244):1789–94.
- 3 Van Gelder IC, Hagens VE, Bosker HA, Kingma JH *et al.* Rate Control versus Electrical Cardioversion for Persistent Atrial Fibrillation (RACE) Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 2002;**347**(23):1834–40.
- 4 Wyse DG, Waldo AL, DiMarco JP, Domanski MJ *et al.* The Atrial Fibrillation Follow-up Investigation of Rhythm Management (AFFIRM) Investigators. A comparison of rate control and rhythm control in patients with atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med* 2002;**347**(23):1825–33.
- 5 Carlsson J, Miketic S, Windler J, Cuneo A *et al.* Randomised trial of rate-control versus rhythm-control in persistent atrial fibrillations: Strategies of Treatment of Atrial Fibrillation (STAF) study. *J Am Coll Cardiol* (in press).

CHRISTOPHER BOOS  
*Specialist Registrar in Cardiology*

RANJIT MORE  
*Consultant Cardiologist*

*Department of Cardiology, St Mary's Hospital,  
Portsmouth*