

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](http://www.sciencedirect.com)

African Journal of Emergency Medicine

journal homepage: www.sciencedirect.com

COMMENTARY

Cervical collars and immobilisation: A South African best practice recommendation



Minerves et immobilisations: Recommandation tirée des meilleures pratiques sud-africaines

D. Stanton^{a,*}, T. Hardcastle^b, D. Muhlbauer^c, D. van Zyl^d^a Netcare Education, Faculty of Emergency and Critical Care, South Africa^b University of Kwazulu Natal, Trauma Surgery Training Unit, Inkosi Albert Luthuli Central Hospital Trauma Service and Trauma ICU, South Africa^c Department of Emergency Medical Care and Rescue, Durban University of Technology, South Africa^d Life Flora Hospital Advanced Life Support Unit, South Africa

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 15 July 2016

Revised 22 November 2016

Accepted 10 January 2017

Available online 28 January 2017

ABSTRACT

Introduction: The consequences of spinal injury as a result of trauma can be devastating. Spinal immobilisation using hard trauma boards and rigid cervical collars has traditionally been the standard response to suspected spinal injury patients even though the risk may be extremely low. Recently, adverse events due to the method of immobilisation have challenged the need for motion restriction in all trauma patients. International guidelines have been published for protection of the spine during transport and this article brings those guidelines into the South African context.

Recommendations: Trauma patients need to be properly assessed using both an approved list of high and low risk factors, as well as a thorough examination. They should then be managed accordingly. Internationally validated assessment strategies have been developed, and should be used as part of the patient assessment. The method of motion restriction should be selected to suit the situation. The use of a vacuum mattress is the preferable technique, with the use of a trauma board being the least desirable.

Conclusion: The need for motion restriction in suspected spinal injury should be properly evaluated and appropriate action taken. Not all trauma patients require spinal motion restriction.

© 2017 African Federation for Emergency Medicine. Publishing services provided by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Les conséquences des lésions de la moelle épinière suite à un traumatisme peuvent être dévastatrices. L'immobilisation de la colonne vertébrale au moyen d'une planche dorsale rigide et de minerves rigides constituait par le passé la réponse standard aux patients que l'on suspectait de souffrir de lésions de la moelle épinière, même si le risque pouvait être extrêmement faible. Récemment, des événements indésirables qui se sont produits du fait de cette méthode d'immobilisation ont remis en question la nécessité de restreindre les mouvements chez tous les patients victimes de traumatisme. Des directives internationales ont été publiées sur la protection de la colonne vertébrale au cours du transport, et cet article adapte ces directives au contexte sud-africain.

Recommandations: Les patients victimes de traumatisme doivent être adéquatement évalués en utilisant une liste approuvée de facteurs de risques faibles et élevés, et en procédant à un examen approfondi. Ils devraient être pris en charge en conséquence. Des stratégies d'évaluation validées au niveau international ont été développées, et devraient être utilisées dans le cadre de l'évaluation du patient. La méthode de restriction des mouvements devrait être sélectionnée en fonction de la situation. L'utilisation d'un matelas immobilisateur à dépression constitue la technique privilégiée, l'utilisation d'une planche dorsale étant la moins recommandée.

Peer review under responsibility of African Federation for Emergency Medicine.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: david.stanton@netcare.co.za (D. Stanton).<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.afjem.2017.01.007>

2211-419X/© 2017 African Federation for Emergency Medicine. Publishing services provided by Elsevier B.V.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Conclusion: La nécessité de restreindre les mouvements en cas de suspicion de lésions de la moelle épinière devrait être adéquatement évaluée et des mesures appropriées doivent être prises. Il n'est pas nécessaire de restreindre les mouvements de la colonne vertébrale chez tous les patients de traumatisme. © 2017 African Federation for Emergency Medicine. Publishing services provided by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

African relevance

- Injuries – including spinal injuries – are a significant contributor to morbidity, both nationally and on the continent.
- Despite resource restrictions, treatment of spinal-injured patients needs to be applied correctly to optimise outcomes.
- Unnecessary spinal immobilisation is unproven and wastes valuable resources that can be better applied elsewhere in the care system.

Introduction

In April 2016, we performed a structured review of the literature in English-language publications in the Pubmed and Cochrane libraries, using the following search terms: 'spinal injuries' OR 'spinal cord injuries' AND 'emergency treatment' OR 'emergency care' OR 'first aid' AND 'immobilisation' OR 'immobilization' OR 'trauma board' OR 'spine board' OR 'cervical collar'.

The search revealed no randomised controlled trials. Some guideline documents were identified, and these were used as the influences of this guideline. The main guideline documents identified were:

- 1) ACEP Board of Directors: EMS management of patients with potential spinal injury [1].
- 2) Faculty of Pre-hospital Care (UK): Pre-hospital spinal immobilisation: An initial consensus statement [2].
- 3) International Trauma Life Support: Long backboard use for spinal motion restriction of the trauma patient [3].
- 4) Faculty of Pre-hospital Care (UK): Minimal patient handling: A faculty of pre-hospital care consensus statement [4].
- 5) EMS spinal precautions and the use of the long backboard – Resource document to the position statement of the national association of EMS Physicians and the American College of Surgeons Committee on Trauma [5].

Spinal injury due to trauma is devastating even though the occurrence of actual cervical injury in trauma cases is rare (2–4%). Of those with a skeletal cervical injury only 20% will have cord injury [6–9]. The force required to fracture the spine is high, with one study showing that 1000 N is required to fracture the cervical spine [10] and another showing a minimum of 3000 N to fracture the lumbar spine [11], making such injuries unlikely. There has, however, been significant concern that a minor injury can become debilitating during the process of moving the patient.

In order to prevent secondary injury, spinal immobilisation using rigid cervical collars and hard trauma boards has been advocated as the mainstay of care in trauma patients for the past few decades [12]. In certain situations it has become standard practice to immobilise every trauma patient [13,14], usually for “just-in-case” purposes.

Evidence of early secondary deterioration from spinal injuries is very rare and records of sudden deterioration following sudden movement are not very readily available [15,16].

There has been much literature published in recent years that challenges the tradition of spinal immobilisation, with descriptions of real adverse events caused by the immobilisation techniques [9,13]. While management of potential spinal injury is important

[17], the interventions taken should not cause adverse events and further deterioration in the patient's condition.

The term “spinal immobilisation” is also misleading, as total non-movement is near impossible to achieve. To this end the term “motion restriction” is more commonly used, as it is more descriptive of the desired objective.

International guidelines have been published to balance the need for spinal stability and reduction of adverse events [1,2,4]. This article sets out to update the practice of spinal motion restriction and present South African guidelines which are in line with current research and clinical understanding.

Recommendations

Recognition of spinal injury

The identification of the injured spinal cord is often very difficult in the prehospital setting, and thus appropriate action should be taken to manage patients that may have such an injury. A thorough assessment, using internationally validated tools, will safely allow for sound treatment actions.

Accepted neurological and orthopaedic signs and symptoms indicating a high risk of spinal cord injury include [1]:

- Pain over the spine on palpation or movement.
- Obvious deformity of the spinal column.
- Unexplained hypotension coupled with absence of a tachycardia.
- Decreased motor and sensory function in upper or lower extremities; including pins-and-needles or loss of sensation (numbness).
- Weakness or loss of movement (paralysis).

Patient assessment

The Canadian C-Spine rule is a validated and reliable tool to assess the neck for the presence of a possible cervical spinal fracture [6,7,18]. To be reliable the patient must be able to communicate, not be under the influence of drugs or alcohol and be willing to cooperate [19]. It must be borne in mind that this tool evaluates the neck only, and motion restriction of the rest of the spine may be required, dependent on mechanism and evaluation.

The C-Spine rule uses factors derived from the mechanism of injury [7,20] to determine need for motion restriction (Fig. 1). If high risk factors are present, motion restriction should be performed, while if there are only low risk factors present the attendant can consider clearing the cervical spine.

Spinal motion restriction is generally not indicated for penetrating trauma [2,21–23]. If there are signs of focal neurological fallout (such as pins-and-needles, paraesthesia, weakness), then spinal motion restriction may be considered, but this should not delay the transportation of the patient.

Patient management

Four central areas are important in the management of a patient with a potential spinal injury: minimal patient handling, extrication procedures, cervical spinal management including collars, and spinal motion restriction.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5650371>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/5650371>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)