physicians. In the United States, the supervisory model is used most often. Applying the metaphor in Warner’s editorial, we could say that in Canada older anesthesiologists are “in the driver’s seat,” whereas in the United States, they usually are “backseat drivers” – involved in the crucial parts of the anesthetic but otherwise leaving patient care to the individual actually “behind the wheel.” This difference in practice could affect the applicability of the findings of Tessler et al. to anesthesia practice in the United States, where the age and skills of the anesthesiologist are only part of the equation – where the experience and knowledge of the older anesthesiologist might well be of more consequence than his/her decreased attention span, possible visual/hearing impairment, longer reaction and processing times, or other factors that could be related to the increased “crash rates” of older physicians cited in the study.

As noted both by Tessler et al. and by Warner, there is sufficient research on this topic to establish that physicians do not age like fine wines. However, especially in the absence of information as to what actions (or lack thereof) by the anesthesiologists involved lead to the lawsuits, this study is just the first step. As both Tessler et al. and Warner conclude, further research is essential – research based on the supervisory practice model that will help us determine just how and to what extent the observed correlation between anesthesiologist age and patient outcomes applies to practice in the United States.

Ian J. Gilmour, M.D., F.R.C.P.C., Charlotte, North Carolina.iegilmour@yahoo.com
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Take Away Some of the Keys

To the Editor:
The excellent article by Tessler et al. and the accompanying editorial by Warner offer an intriguing glimpse into one of many challenges confronting older anesthesiologists. However, this study paints in broad strokes the issue of medico-legal experience that might obscure important details. The risk of suboptimal clinical outcomes and resulting litigation can be minimized if all clinicians, including older ones, limit their practice to exclude those procedures that they rarely perform. As demonstrated in a report on surgical mortality subsequent to various complex surgical procedures, older surgeons’ age was not an independent predictor of surgical risk, provided that the surgeon maintained a high volume in those specific procedures. On the other hand, bad outcomes occurred most frequently among older surgeons who maintained low volumes in those same procedures.

The study by Tessler et al. failed to identify this potential confounding variable among their study subjects. Although the authors’ analysis did account for overall clinical volume, the small numbers precluded further stratification to identify which of those bad outcomes occurred when older anesthesiologists were working outside their “comfort zone” – regardless of whether or not these were intrinsically complex cases or straightforward cases in unfamiliar patient populations (i.e., pediatrics, bariatrics, obstetrics, and so forth). The study of surgical mortality (previously cited) suggests that bad outcomes among older anesthesiologists could be minimized by stricter attention to case assignment. To extend Warner’s analogy, maybe we should design ignition keys that restrict a senior citizen’s access to a 4-cylinder pickup truck on a snowy winter evening as well as a 16-cylinder high-performance sports car on a sunny afternoon.

As suggested by the authors, these findings should inspire additional studies to examine what is a growing source of concern as our specialty continues to age.

Jonathan D. Katz, M.D., Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut. jonathan.katz@yale.edu
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Maybe It Isn’t Aging

To the Editor:
The report by Tessler et al. and the accompanying editorial by Warner cautiously examine the possibility that senior anesthesiologists, by virtue of age, pose a greater risk to patients. This natural concern is prompted by Tessler et al.’s finding that anesthesiologists older than 65 in the period between 1993 and 2002 incurred a greater risk of litigation than anesthesiologists younger than 51 yr.