

Encephalitis guidelines: a recipe for success?

Rhys H Thomas and Philip EM Smith

Knowledge is of two kinds. We know a subject ourselves, or we know where we can find information on it.

Samuel Johnson (1709–84)¹

Clinical governance, evidence-based medicine and guidelines are regarded with suspicion by some clinicians.² Audit, however, has become embedded in clinical practice, a core activity for junior doctors and obligatory content for medical interviews. Good audits on really important topics still sometimes produce results so painful that changes in clinical practice must follow. In the current issue of *Clinical Medicine*, an audit of viral encephalitis management in a single centre by Bell and colleagues highlights inconsistencies of practice which, if representative of other units, suggest suboptimal management of a potentially devastating but treatable condition.³

Viral encephalitis is uncommon, a typical district general hospital, for example, may see only one or two cases per year.⁴ It presents non-specifically with headache, fever, altered consciousness, seizures and behavioural disturbance, a symptom complex with a broad differential diagnosis.⁵ Children particularly may present atypically. The variable clinical presentation means its diagnosis is often delayed; even the reliable biomarker – polymerase chain reaction (PCR) to herpes simplex virus – may be negative in the first 10 days and positive overall in only 50%.⁶ When suspected and treated promptly with aciclovir, the mortality of viral encephalitis is massively reduced from 70 to 20%.⁷ Aciclovir is well tolerated and generally safe (with notable exceptions) and most effective if started within 48 hours. Perhaps the principal reason for delayed diagnosis and treatment of encephalitis is that acute physicians do not consider it sufficiently often or early. When they do, it is still uncommon enough for 90% of those prescribed aciclovir for encephalopathy to have different diagnoses at discharge.³ Such a policy of ‘over-diagnosis and over-reaction’, however, is justified to prevent the devastating neurological sequelae of viral encephalitis.

Cerebrospinal fluid is necessary to diagnose viral encephalitis definitively with PCR, and to exclude bacterial, fungal or paraneoplastic encephalopathies. The need for computed tomography (CT) imaging before diagnostic lumbar puncture (LP) in suspected encephalitis remains surprisingly contentious, with

no agreed UK audit standard. The 2001 guidance for LP in adults with meningitis perhaps needs reappraisal as access to CT improves.⁸ Rapid imaging and specialist interpretation are increasingly available in emergency units to meet rigorous targets for stroke thrombolysis and head injury. Although CT may be normal in early viral encephalitis, brain shift and hydrocephalus (reliably identifiable on CT) must be excluded before LP,⁶ at least in health systems where such imaging is readily available. Bell *et al*’s audit identified significant CT brain scan abnormalities among 21 patients with suspected encephalitis: three new strokes, two tumours, one subdural haematoma and one subarachnoid haemorrhage.³ Magnetic resonance brain scanning, preferably with diffusion weighting, might identify cerebral changes facilitating an early positive diagnosis of viral encephalitis. However, this modality is impractical in confused and deteriorating patients, especially out of hours; CT scanning remains the current standard emergency imaging modality for suspected viral encephalitis.

Notwithstanding the imaging issue, even LP itself may be performed inconsistently or incompletely. If 6/17 (35%) omit to measure opening pressure and 4/17 (24%) forget to take a contemporaneous blood glucose then valuable data are being lost and the diagnosis delayed or incomplete.⁴ The skill of LP is a core competency for medical trainees and these audit findings should stimulate a review of their learning.

Despite research advances in viral encephalitis, the monopoly of knowledge seems to be in the wrong heads and the wrong journals. A trawl through emergency medical literature in 2004 found no published description of the need for early aciclovir therapy in viral encephalitis, in marked contrast to widely publicised indications for early antibiotics in bacterial meningitis.¹⁰ The baton of early recognition and proactive aciclovir treatment must now be passed to acute physicians and emergency department clinicians: ‘Infrequent occurrences with catastrophic consequences are not best studied through small case series.’⁹

A simple and auditable guideline is clearly needed. The Infectious Diseases Society of America has only recently published evidence-based clinical guidelines on viral encephalitis⁷; UK guidelines are currently being developed.⁵ Evidence-based guidelines inevitably contain areas of uncertainty but this should not prevent their implementation. Pragmatic guidelines evolve as new evidence emerges, as exemplified by the UK Resuscitation Council’s excellent advanced life support guidelines.¹¹ Simply writing an evidence-based guideline will not influence practice: the next audit cycle step is to communicate and implement the guideline. A guideline approach to managing acute encephalopathy will not identify every case of viral encephalitis, but is likely to improve the outcome for many. The

^{1,2}**Rhys H Thomas**, Specialty Registrar in Neurology; ²**Philip EM Smith**, Consultant Neurologist

¹Wales Epilepsy Research Network, Institute of Life Sciences, Swansea University; ²Department of Neurology, University Hospital of Wales, Cardiff

message of raised awareness must now be disseminated to acute care physicians and the necessary skills for encephalitis diagnosis (especially LP) given renewed teaching focus. Following a cook-book approach to medicine may be unpalatable to some, but for 'infrequent occurrences with catastrophic consequences' it may provide the recipe for success.

Competing interests

PS is a member of the UK Encephalitis Guidelines Panel.

References

- 1 Boswell J. *The life of Samuel Johnson, LL.D. Comprehending an account of his studies and numerous works in chronological order*, Vol 1. London: Bloomsbury, 1820:418.
- 2 Clinicians for the Restoration of Autonomous Practice (CRAP) Writing Group. Evidence-based medicine: unmasking the ugly truth. *BMJ* 2002;325:1496–8.
- 3 Bell DJ, Suckling R, Rothburn MM *et al*. Management of suspected herpes simplex virus encephalitis in adults in a UK teaching hospital. *Clin Med* 2009;9:231–5.
- 4 Kennedy PGE. Viral encephalitis. *J Neurol* 2005;252:268–72.
- 5 Solomon T, Hart IJ, Beeching NJ. Viral encephalitis: a clinician's guide. *Prac Neurol* 2007;7:288–305.
- 6 Benson PC, Swadron SP. Empiric acyclovir is infrequently initiated in the emergency department to patients ultimately diagnosed with encephalitis. *Ann Emerg Med* 2006;47:100–5.
- 7 Tunkel AR, Glaser CA, Bloch KC *et al*. The management of encephalitis: Clinical practice guidelines by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis* 2008;47:303–27.
- 8 Whitley RJ. Herpes simplex encephalitis: adolescents and adults. *Antiviral Res* 2006;71:141–8.
- 9 Hasbun R, Abrahams J, Jekel J, Quagliarello VJ. Computed tomography of the head before lumbar puncture in adults with suspected meningitis. *N Engl J Med* 2001;345:1727–33.
- 10 Ridsdale L, Massey R, Clark L. Preventing neurophobia in medical students, and so future doctors. *Pract Neurol* 2007;7:116–23.
- 11 Resuscitation Council (UK). *Advanced life support*, 5th edn. London: Resuscitation Council (UK), 2006.
- 12 Greig PR, Goroszeniuk D. Role of computed tomography before lumbar puncture: a survey of clinical practice. *Postgrad Med J* 2006;82:162–5.

Address for correspondence: Professor PEM Smith, The Epilepsy Unit, University Hospital of Wales, Health Park, Cardiff CF14 4XW. Email: smithpe@cardiff.ac.uk

Diploma in Geriatric Medicine

The Diploma in Geriatric Medicine (DGM) is designed to give recognition of competence in the provision of care for the elderly and is particularly suitable for general practitioner vocational trainees and clinical assistants. It is also suitable for aspiring candidates for any career post in Geriatric Medicine, or in allied fields such as the Psychiatry of Old Age, who wish to demonstrate their knowledge of the subject.

The DGM now consists of a multiple-choice paper written examination and a standardised clinical examination. You are advised to obtain details of this from the address below before applying to take the exam.

The next Written Examination will be held on **Tuesday 14 July 2009**. The application form, together with the necessary documentation and fee, must reach the College by **Friday 19 June 2009**.

The Clinical Examination will be held on **Tuesday 3 and Wednesday 4 November 2009**. The closing date for applications to the Clinical Section will be **Friday 18 September 2009**.

The Examination fee for the Part 1 Written Examination is £200, for the Part 2 Clinical Examination the fee is £295.

Candidates must have held a post approved for professional training in a department specialising in the care of the elderly or have had experience over a period of two years since full registration or equivalent in which the care of the elderly formed a significant part.

Further details and an application form may be obtained from:

The Diploma in Geriatric Medicine,
Examinations Office
Royal College of Physicians of London,
11 St Andrews Place,
Regent's Park, London NW1 4LE
Luke.Harper@mrcpuk.org
020 7935 1174 ext 445



**Royal College
of Physicians**

Setting higher medical standards

Registered Charity No 210508