



When the Patient Says NO

Lifestar Conference
The University of Tennessee,
Knoxville
August 18, 2012

[Overview]

- Foundations
- Informed consent/refusal of treatment
- Resources

“Medicine is something we offer people,
not something we inflict on them.”

Thom Dick, *EMS Magazine* May, 2008

[Case: Rose]

- Patient is a female in her 80s. Daughter called 911 because mother c/o chest pain
- She permits you to assess her, but refuses transport or treatment
 - Skin pale, cool, and diaphoretic
 - Pulse 40, BP 110/90
 - Acknowledges being nauseous
 - Refuses to comment on chest pain

[EMT Oath]

- Be it pledged as an Emergency Medical Technician, I will honor the physical and judicial laws of God and man. I will follow that regimen which, according to my ability and judgment, I consider for **the benefit of patients** and abstain from whatever is deleterious and mischievous, nor shall I suggest any such counsel.

Written by: Charles B. Gillespie, M.D.

Adopted by the National Association of Emergency Medical Technicians, 1978



[EMT Code of Ethics]

- A fundamental responsibility of the Emergency Medical Technician is to conserve life, **to alleviate suffering**, to promote health, **to do no harm**, and to encourage the quality and equal availability of emergency medical care.

Written by: Charles B. Gillespie, M.D.

Adopted by the National Association of Emergency Medical Technicians, 1978



[“Benefit” “Harm” “Suffering”]

- Universal values
 - Everyone wants to be helped, not to be harmed, to be respected
- Individual expression
 - Help to one person may be harm to another person
 - Help in one context may be harm in another context

Informed Consent

- Criteria: Competent decision maker, fully informed, free of coercion
- Goals
 - to ensure respect for patient choices even if we do not agree with those choices
 - to ensure that patients do not make choices under duress, without enough information, or while of limited ability to process information or the consequences of the decision for their lives



- Respect for persons means that informed, competent patients have the right to refuse medical treatment -- INCLUDING life saving treatment
- It also means we ensure that they really understand what they're doing

[Decision Making Capacity]

- Patients are “capacitated until proven incapacitated”
 - Incapacitated = unsound *mind*, not unsound *decision*
- Contrasted with legal *competence*
- Contrasted with *cognition/orientation*
- 4 abilities
- Sliding scale

[Legal Competence vs. DMC]

- All or nothing (or discrete levels)
- Decided by courts
- Fixed



[Cognition vs. DMC]

- Cognitive impairment is *correlated* with limited DMC, but is not the only criterion
 - Very low cognition usually = lack of capacity
 - Moderately low cognition = not so clear
 - “Orientation” tells us relatively little

[Underlying conditions]

- Other conditions *may or may not* impair DMC for decision at hand
 - Mental health diagnoses
 - Renal conditions
 - High blood glucose
 - Etc...

[4 Abilities for DMC: CURA]

- 1. the ability to Communicate
 - Communication may be written, verbal, or make use of another method, but must be clear
 - May need to be facilitated by translators, paper and pencil, etc.

[4 Abilities for DMC: CURA]

- 2. the ability to Understand relevant information
 - Diagnosis
 - Likely outcomes of accepting or rejecting proposed treatment

[4 Abilities for DMC: CURA]

- 3. the ability to use Rreason (i.e. “means-end” reasoning) to process information
 - Does the treatment choice map on to the patient’s stated goals?
 - Is it consistent with her or his preferences, given the circumstances?

[4 Abilities for DMC: CURA]

- 4. the ability to Appreciate the situation
 - Implications of the choice for her/his life in terms of goals, values, preferences

[DMC: the Sliding Scale]

- Decision making capacity comes in degrees
 - Can wax and wane, depending on a variety of factors
- Pt can have capacity to make some medical decisions but not others
- Higher standard needed for more serious decisions
- Standard reflects *level of ability* NOT *the decision itself*

[Case: Ms. Burton]

- 38-year-old woman, had been drinking alone
- Fell from standing height, hitting her forehead
- LOC, if any, would have been brief
- Contusion and abrasion to her left orbit and forehead
- Oriented, alert, intoxicated, combative, and refusing care
- Vital signs unremarkable except for a modest elevated blood pressure and tachycardia
- Neurological exam was unremarkable

[Ms. Burton con't]

- Refused transport to the ED, claiming that she couldn't afford it
- Admitted to having a headache at the site of the forehead contusion, but said she'd go home and would go the ED immediately if she "got worse"
- Denied depression, suicidal ideation, alcohol abuse
- Stated she only drank on weekends, that she was a professional, and that this had happened "many times before"
- Refused to allow phone calls to family, friends, or co-workers, claiming that this was "none of their business"



A Tool for Assessing DMC: your ACE in the hole

- ACE = Aid to Capacity Evaluation
- Based on the decision the patient is facing at the moment (not a once-and-for-all pronouncement)
- 8 questions
 - Start with open-ended questions
 - Score yes, no, or unsure

[Setting the Stage]

- Identify any communication barriers
 - If necessary and possible, use translators, paper and pencil, etc.
- Assure patients that you want to respect their wishes
 - Encourage them to do their best
 - Remind them that the test is not a “trap”



[Setting the Stage, con't

- Disclose and re-disclose information as necessary
 - Use terms familiar to patient
 - Speak at her/his level of health literacy
- Address family who want to “help”
 - Use if appropriate to facilitate communication, but do not let them influence the patient

Questions that Assess *Understanding*

- 1. Current medical condition
- 2. Proposed treatment
- 3. Alternatives
 - If any reasonable options exist
- 4. Option of refusing treatment
 - Skip this one ...

Questions that Assess *Appreciation*

- 5. Consequences of accepting proposed treatment
 - Financial considerations may be relevant
- 6. Consequences of refusing proposed treatment

Checking for Depression and Psychosis

- 7. “Can you help me understand why you are refusing treatment?”
 - 7a. “Do you have any hope for the future?”
 - 7b. “Do you think anyone is trying to harm you?”



[Communication skills]

- 97.749862% of all medical conflict can be resolved with good communication
- This means
 - Take time
 - Be professional
 - Find out *why*

[Advance Directives]

- Universal DNR: “qualified emergency medical services personnel ... are authorized to follow universal Do Not Resuscitate orders” [TCA 68-11-224(c)]
- When an Advance Directive and a proxy decision maker conflict, the AD generally takes precedence over a proxy
- Tattoo flash: “Consider DNR” ??

[When No means NO]

- Ensure appropriate support (physical and other) prior to departure
- Encourage them to call again if necessary
- Document, even if patient treated at scene but not transported, including:
 - Patient activity at scene
 - Ability to converse
 - Patient improvement
 - Signed waiver (if this can be obtained, it should be)

[What About the Family?]

- Sometimes the patient isn't the only patient
- “Will I get sued?” is not a useful question
 - *not* because it doesn't matter
 - *not* because it can't happen
 - *but* because it shifts the focus away from patient care
 - *and* focus on good patient care is usually the best way to CYA

[Thank you!]

Cases and comments always welcome

Annette Mendola, PhD
Director of Clinical Ethics
(865) 305-5180

amendola@utmck.edu