

she was awarded 40% of 25% of her overall damages. After appeals, this was overturned. In 2012, in *Tabet vs Gett*,⁷ the Australian High Court found that a decrease in the probability of a good outcome was not sufficient to enable a finding of medical negligence. Before this decision, loss of a chance cases were often difficult to defend. Experts could state that anything is possible and under a loss of chance regime, the simple assertion of such a possibility was enough to see the awarding of damages.

Many clinicians decry the trend towards defensive medicine. *What do I need to do to reduce the chance of me being successfully sued?* This can lead to unnecessary investigations and procedures, at increased cost, and the introduction of other risks to the patient. It has not necessarily led to better patient outcomes. The High Court finding could be interpreted by clinicians as setting the standard of medical practice to one which avoids demonstrable patient injury, rather than one which awards the patient the best possible chance of achieving the therapeutic goal, while minimizing the chance of an adverse outcome.

In anaesthetic practice, we are exposed to impediments to effective and efficient workload and workflow, to issues with training, unfamiliar or 'broken' equipment, and communication. Each of these may lead to a decrease in the chance of an optimal patient outcome. Some of these negative factors are demonstrable and measurable, much to the lawyer's benefit, while others are not. But they may be no less significant to patient outcome.

Poor central venous catheter insertion practices may contribute to a central line bloodstream infection, which cannot be overcome by careful sterile dressings.

Prolonged and inadequately treated hypoperfusion, insufficient to cause an attributable injury such as a cerebrovascular or cardiovascular event, may be enough to cause some impairment of renal or other vital organ function. Once this event has occurred, there is a decreased probability of an optimal outcome.

Every time a substandard practice or adverse incident occurs, we shave a piece from the patient's whole, or at least the patient's potential, subject to the patient's current illness and co-morbidities. As with a block of Parmesan cheese, with each shave—no matter how small—we remove from the whole. In doing so, we decrease the chance of optimal patient outcome. Importantly, each of us, as healthcare providers, has a cheese knife, and many of the small shavings that we take cannot be repaired or replaced by another.

The Swiss cheese model is useful as an explanation of many tragic outcomes, and facilitates the design of defences against this. The Parmesan cheese model may be a better representation of the clinician's responsibility in routine patient care and the importance of minimizing any deficiencies in our day-to-day practice.

Declaration of interest

None declared.

References

- 1 Reason J. *Human Error*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990
- 2 Shappell S, Detwiler C, Holcomb K, et al. Human error and commercial aviation accidents: an analysis using the human factors analysis and classification system. *Hum Factors* 2007; **49**: 227–42
- 3 Webster CS. The nuclear power industry as an alternative analogy for safety in anaesthesia and a novel approach for the conceptualisation of safety goals. *Anaesthesia* 2005; **60**: 1115–22
- 4 Woolf SH, Kuzel AJ, Dovey SM, et al. A string of mistakes: the importance of cascade analysis in describing, counting, and preventing medical errors. *Ann Fam Med* 2004; **2**: 317–26
- 5 *Investigation Report AX001-1-2/02 Bundesstelle für Flugunfalluntersuchung (German Federal Bureau of Aircraft Accidents Investigation)*, May 2004. Available from http://cfapp.icao.int/fsix/sr/reports/02001351_final_report_01.pdf
- 6 Abikhair MR, Mahar PD, Cachia AR, et al. Liability in the context of misdiagnosis of melanoma in Australia. *Med J Aust* 2014; **200**: 119–21
- 7 *Tabet vs Gett* (2010) HCA12

British Journal of Anaesthesia **113** (6): 906–9 (2014)
Advance Access publication 30 July 2014 · doi:10.1093/bja/aeu259

Perioperative management of diabetic patients: new controversies

P. Aldam¹, N. Levy^{2*} and G. M. Hall³

¹ Division of Anaesthesia, Addenbrookes Hospital, Cambridge CB2 0QQ, UK

² Department of Anaesthesia, West Suffolk Hospital, Bury St Edmunds IP33 2QZ, UK

³ Department of Anaesthesia, St George's Hospital Medical School, London SW17 0RE, UK

* Corresponding author. E-mail: nicholas.levy@wsh.nhs.uk

The prevalence of diabetes mellitus (DM) is increasing rapidly. In 2011, it was estimated that 366 million people worldwide

had DM with a projected increase to 522 million by 2030. Diabetes is one of the most common non-communicable diseases

and is ranked as one of the top five global causes of premature death. The costs of treating DM are an increasing burden on healthcare budgets. For example, the NHS annual spending on DM was £9.8 billion in 2012 with an expected increase to £16.9 billion in the next 25 yr (~17% of the total NHS budget).¹

Diabetes affects 4–5% of the UK population. However, the recent National Diabetes Inpatient Audit (NaDIA) found an inpatient prevalence of DM ranging from 5.5% to 31.1% within the UK.² Diabetes was associated with increased in-hospital morbidity and consequently increased duration of hospital stay, regardless of medical speciality. This confirms previous work showing a significantly increased duration of hospital stay in diabetic patients undergoing surgery.³

The primary aim of perioperative management of the surgical diabetic patient is to decrease morbidity and hopefully reduce the duration of hospital stay. Two authoritative publications, one by the National Health Services Diabetes in the UK⁴ and the other by the Society for Ambulatory Anesthesia (SAMBA) in the USA,⁵ have provided clear guidelines that are intended to improve perioperative care. The former describes an ideal pathway for all diabetic patients undergoing elective surgery: primary care referral, surgical outpatients, preoperative assessment, hospital admission, theatre and recovery, postoperative care, and discharge. Although this pathway will be a valuable standard for elective surgery, there is limited recognition in the guidelines that urgent and emergency surgery constitute an increasing proportion of patients in many hospitals. It is notable that both guidelines provide limited supporting evidence due to the absence of studies in this field, thus they are largely based on expert opinion. They should be considered ‘work in progress’.

It is now over 3 yr since the publication of these two guidelines, and with the publication of new evidence, the purpose of this editorial is to examine the following areas of clinical controversy: utility of preoperative glycated haemoglobin values (HbA_{1c}), metformin use perioperatively, dose of long-acting insulins before surgery, and ideal blood glucose range and measurement error. Editorials on choice of i.v. fluid and the use of dexamethasone in the diabetic patient have previously been published.^{6,7}

Utility of preoperative glycated haemoglobin values (HbA_{1c})

It is well established that diabetic patients undergoing major surgery, cardiac and non-cardiac, are at increased risk of mortality and morbidity.^{8–10} Furthermore, the relationship between inadequate preoperative glucose control and adverse outcomes has also been found in several surgical specialities: orthopaedics,¹¹ colorectal,¹² spinal,¹³ vascular,¹⁴ and cardiac.¹⁵ These studies included diabetic and non-diabetic patients and it is notable that many non-diabetic patients were found to have elevated HbA_{1c} values (>6% or >42 mmol mol⁻¹). Thus, there is evidence to show that good preoperative glycaemic control, as determined by HbA_{1c} concentrations, is associated with a lower incidence of systemic

and surgical complications, decreased mortality, and shorter duration of hospital stay.

The importance of glycated haemoglobin was emphasized recently by its incorporation into guidelines for the diagnosis of DM in the UK,¹⁶ following the recommendations of the WHO. An HbA_{1c} value >6.5% or 48 mmol mol⁻¹, on repeated testing, is diagnostic of DM, with concentrations between 6.0% and 6.4% or 42 and 47 mmol mol⁻¹, indicating a high risk of diabetes. The non-diabetic reference range is 4.0–6.0% or 20–42 mmol mol⁻¹. Target HbA_{1c} concentrations for diabetic patients are 6.5–7.5% or 48–58 mmol mol⁻¹ with the higher concentrations accepted for patients at risk of hypoglycaemia.

We suggest that preoperative HbA_{1c} values should be determined in all patients undergoing major surgery, and also in all elective surgical patients with diabetes. Not only will this strategy diagnose DM in some patients with undiagnosed DM, it may also influence the timing of elective surgery. Glycated haemoglobin values >8.6% or 70 mmol mol⁻¹ were associated with a four-fold increase in mortality after cardiac surgery.¹⁵ Delaying elective major surgery while glycaemic control is improved is predicted to decrease mortality and serious morbidity—an objective that patient and clinician will surely support!

Perioperative use of metformin

Metformin is a key drug in the treatment of type 2 diabetes. It acts as an insulin sensitizer and also inhibits gluconeogenesis. If given as the sole therapeutic agent, it does not cause hypoglycaemia. The risk of lactic acidosis in patients taking metformin is very low, but is more likely in those with renal impairment. Guidelines from NICE,¹⁷ the British National Formulary,¹⁸ and the drug manufacturer’s datasheet¹⁹ all advise the withdrawal of metformin before surgery, even 48 h before operation in one instance.¹⁹

For patients undergoing surgery with a period of short starvation, the NHS guidelines advise the continuation of metformin throughout the day of surgery with the omission of the lunchtime dose if the drug is taken three times a day and provided certain criteria are fulfilled (no contrast medium is used, and the eGFR is >50 ml min⁻¹ 1.73 m⁻²).⁴ The NHS guidelines are at variance with established practice but are supported by recent guidance from the Royal College of Radiologists. The Royal College of Radiologists recommend that there is no need to discontinue metformin after contrast in patients with serum creatinine within the normal reference range, eGFR >60 ml min⁻¹, or both, and in patients with impaired renal function, they suggest that any decision to stop it for 48 h should be made in consultation with the referring clinic.²⁰ The inconsistency highlights the confusion about the current use of metformin perioperatively.

The NHS guidelines admit that there is limited evidence to support the perioperative recommendations on metformin. However, in a retrospective survey of 1284 diabetic cardiac surgical patients, it was found that those who continued with metformin, often inadvertently, had improved outcomes

compared with those patients who omitted metformin as instructed.²¹ Whether such benefits may occur in general surgical patients has yet to be established. At present, a rational conclusion is to continue metformin throughout the perioperative period in all patients with normal renal function. This will enhance the activity of residual insulin secretion in type 2 diabetic patients.

Optimal dose of perioperative long-acting analogue insulin

Insulin therapy has changed for many diabetic patients with the introduction of basal insulin formulations, such as insulin detemir and glargine, and short-acting analogues. This has enabled patients with type 1 DM to manage both the basal and postprandial insulin requirements and try to mimic the non-diabetic state. Long-acting insulin therapy is used increasingly in type 2 diabetes if glycaemic control is poor. Long-acting insulins are given either in the evening or morning.

The NHS guidelines recommend that the usual dose of long-acting insulin should be given, morning or evening as appropriate, regardless of whether there is a short or long period of starvation.⁴ The SAMBA guidelines provide a similar recommendation for ambulatory surgery.⁵ Both authorities acknowledge that the dose of long-acting insulin may need to be decreased in patients who snack in addition to regular meals ('grazing'), miss meals, or have large reductions in overnight blood glucose values. A decrease in the usual dose of long-acting insulin by a third is suggested in these circumstances.⁴ In support of this proposal, the NHS guidelines at that time were only able to cite an abstract which reported no problems with glucose control when the usual dose of long-acting insulin was continued.

A recent detailed investigation tried to answer the question—'which dose of insulin glargine should be administered on the evening before surgery?'.²² Four hundred and one types 1 and 2 diabetic patients who were undergoing elective non-cardiac surgery were studied. Three evening insulin glargine regimens were evaluated: take 80% of usual dose, ask the patient's physician for the dose, or a simple dose schedule derived locally. The primary endpoint was the attainment of a preoperative fasting blood glucose in the range 5.5–9.9 mmol litre⁻¹.

Target glucose concentrations were achieved more easily in patients taking insulin glargine only (type 2 DM) than in those taking glargine and bolus insulin. There were no significant differences between the three groups in the number of patients achieving glucose values between 5.5 and 9.9 mmol litre⁻¹ in the insulin glargine only patients, but a notable difference in the preoperative dose: 80% in the 80% usual dose group, 64% in the ask physician group, and 54% in the local dose schedule group. Similarly, in the insulin glargine and bolus insulin patients, there were no significant differences in the number of patients achieving the target glucose range; the preoperative evening doses were 80% in the 80% usual insulin dose group, 69% in the ask physician group, and 81% in the local dose schedule group.

Hypoglycaemia was uncommon; only two patients had preoperative glucose values of 2.7 and 3.1 mmol litre⁻¹. Conversely, only two patients had severe hyperglycaemia (>22 mmol litre⁻¹), and in one patient, this was the result of a self-medication error. The main limitation of the study was the sole endpoint of preoperative glucose values. Further work is necessary to show whether adequate intra- and postoperative glycaemic control can be obtained with these dosing schedules. Nevertheless, this study is an important step in providing data on which to determine basal insulin dosage before surgery. Currently, 80% of the usual evening dose is a simple, safe, and effective schema.

Ideal blood glucose range and measurement error

There is almost unanimity between the NHS guidelines and the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists with the American Diabetes Association Consensus Statement²³ that the ideal glucose range in hospital for non-critically ill diabetic patients should be 6–10 mmol litre⁻¹ (in the USA, the lower limit is 100 mg dl⁻¹ or 5.6 mmol litre⁻¹). There is considerable evidence that good glycaemic control decreases perioperative infection, morbidity, and mortality.^{9–10} The NHS guidelines state that a range of 4–12 mmol litre⁻¹ is also acceptable.

We argue that this extended range should not be used. The upper limit of 12 mmol litre⁻¹ is similar to the concentration that *in vitro* results in a variety of changes in endothelial function, expression of adhesion molecules, impaired neutrophil function, enhanced cytokine synthesis, and decreased complement activity which combine to exacerbate inflammation and increase the risk of infection.²⁴ The lower limit of 4 mmol litre⁻¹ is close to glucose values that, in some diabetic patients, will induce hypoglycaemic symptoms. Furthermore, safe use of the extended range will be critically dependent on accurate measurements of blood glucose values.

It is salutary to note that the FDA in the USA allows a 20% error for glucose meters at concentrations above 100 mg dl⁻¹ (5.6 mmol litre⁻¹) and a 15% error for values <100 mg dl⁻¹. Thus, a measured concentration of 4 mmol litre⁻¹ will have an actual value between 3.4 and 4.6 mmol litre⁻¹, while a measured concentration of 12 mmol litre⁻¹ will have an actual value between 9.6 and 14.4 mmol litre⁻¹. In addition, measurement of glucose values with assay strips and glucose meters and by arterial gas analysis overestimates concentrations at low values. Also many factors commonly found in surgical patients can affect the measurement: poor peripheral perfusion, anaemia, increased bilirubin and uric acid, and drugs such as paracetamol, dopamine, and mannitol.²⁵ The title of this last reference is particularly apposite to the control and measurement of glucose perioperatively—'The devil is in the details'.

In conclusion, there can be no doubt that the publication of guidelines will facilitate the care of surgical diabetic patients. Nevertheless, these important documents should not be accepted uncritically. There is a tendency for guidelines to be judged by the status of the supporting organizations rather than the scientific merit of the publication. In which case, the

guidelines become an assertion of authority—a territorial imperative—that must not be questioned.²⁶ In this article, we have addressed several controversial new areas in the perioperative care of the diabetic patient where recent research challenges current accepted practice. We suggest that the guidelines will need to evolve rapidly in the next few years to remain relevant.

Declaration of interest

In the last 4 yr, N.L. has received rail travel expenses to attend meetings, as part of the NHS Diabetes writing group for Management of adults with diabetes undergoing surgery and elective procedures: improving standards. April 2011. G.M.H. is an editor of *Anesthesia and Analgesia*.

References

- Hex N, Bartlett C, Wright D, Taylor M, Varley D. Estimating the current and future costs of Type 1 and Type 2 diabetes in the United Kingdom, including direct health costs and indirect societal and productivity costs. *Diabet Med* 2012; **29**: 855–62
- NHS Diabetes. *National Diabetes Inpatient Audit (NaDIA)*, 2012. Available from <http://www.diabetes.org.uk/Documents/Reports/NaDIA-annual-report-2012-0613.pdf> (accessed 22 April 2014)
- Sampson MJ, Dozio N, Ferguson B, Dhataria K. Total and excess bed occupancy by age, speciality and insulin use for nearly one million diabetes patients discharged from all English Acute Hospitals. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract* 2007; **77**: 92–8
- National Health Service Diabetes, United Kingdom. Management of adults with diabetes undergoing surgery and elective procedures: improving standards, 2011. Available from <https://www.diabetes.org.uk/Documents/Professionals/Reports%20and%20statistics/Management%20of%20adults%20with%20diabetes%20undergoing%20surgery%20and%20elective%20procedures%20-%20improving%20standards.pdf> (accessed 22 April 2014)
- Joshi GP, Chung F, Vann MA, et al. Society for ambulatory anesthesia consensus statement on perioperative blood glucose management in diabetic patients undergoing ambulatory surgery. *Anesth Analg* 2010; **111**: 1378–87
- Simpson AK, Levy N, Hall GM. Peri-operative i.v.: fluids in diabetic patients—don't forget the salt. *Anaesthesia* 2008; **63**: 1043–5
- Dhataria K. Does dexamethasone-induced hyperglycaemia contribute to postoperative morbidity and mortality? *Br J Anaesth* 2013; **110**: 675–8
- Lee TH, Marcantonio ER, Mangione CM, et al. Derivation and prospective validation of a simple index for prediction of cardiac risk of major noncardiac surgery. *Circulation* 1999; **100**: 1043–9
- Frisch A, Chandra P, Smiley D, et al. Prevalence and clinical outcome of hyperglycemia in the perioperative period in noncardiac surgery. *Diabetes Care* 2010; **33**: 1783–8
- Kwon S, Thompson R, Patchen D, Yanez D, Farrokhi E, Flum D. Importance of perioperative glycemic control in general surgery: a report from the Surgical Care and Outcomes Assessment Program. *Ann Surg* 2013; **257**: 8–14
- Marchant MH, Viens NA, Cook C, Vail TP, Bolognesi MP. The impact of glycemic control and diabetes mellitus on perioperative outcomes after total joint arthroplasty. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2009; **91**: 1621–9
- Gustafsson UO, Thorell A, Soop M, Ljungqvist O, Nygren J. Haemoglobin A1c as a predictor of postoperative hyperglycaemia and complications after major colorectal surgery. *Br J Surg* 2009; **96**: 1358–64
- Walid MS, Newman BF, Yelverton JC, Nutter JP, Ajjan M, Robinson JS. Prevalence of previously unknown elevation of glycosylated haemoglobin in spine surgery patients and impact on length of stay and total cost. *J Hosp Med* 2010; **5**: E10–4
- O'Sullivan CJ, Hynes N, Mahendran B, et al. Haemoglobin A1c (HbA1C) in non-diabetic and diabetic vascular patients. Is HbA1C an independent risk factor and predictor of adverse outcome? *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg* 2006; **32**: 188–97
- Halkos ME, Lattouf OM, Puskas JD, et al. Elevated preoperative haemoglobin A1c level is associated with reduced long-term survival after coronary artery bypass surgery. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2008; **86**: 1431–7
- John WG, on behalf of the UK Department of Health Advisory Committee on Diabetes. Use of HbA_{1c} in the diagnosis of diabetes mellitus in the UK. The implementation of World Health Organization guidance 2011. *Diabet Med* 2012; **29**: 1350–7
- National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. *Type 2 Diabetes Clinical Guideline 87*. Available from <http://www.nice.org.uk/cg87> (accessed 22 April 2014)
- British Medical Association and Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain. *British National Formulary*. London: 2011
- The Electronic Medicines Compendium. Metformin summary of product characteristics. Available from http://www.medicines.org.uk/emc/medicine/23244/SPC#CLINICAL_PRECAUTIONS (accessed 22 April 2014)
- The Royal College of Radiologists. *Standards for Intravascular Contrast Agent Administration to Adult Patients*, 2nd Edn. London: The Royal College of Radiologists, 2010. Available from [https://www.rcr.ac.uk/docs/radiology/pdf/BFCR\(10\)4_Stand_contrast.pdf](https://www.rcr.ac.uk/docs/radiology/pdf/BFCR(10)4_Stand_contrast.pdf) (accessed 22 April 2014)
- Duncan AI, Koch CG, Xu M, et al. Recent metformin ingestion does not increase in-hospital morbidity or mortality after cardiac surgery. *Anesth Analg* 2007; **104**: 42–50
- Rosenblatt SI, Dukatz T, Jahn R, et al. Insulin glargine dosing before next-day surgery: comparing three strategies. *J Clin Anesth* 2012; **24**: 610–7
- Moghissi ES, Korytkowski MT, Di Nardo M, et al. American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists and American Diabetes Association consensus statement on inpatient glycemic control. *Endocr Pract* 2009; **15**: 353–69
- Langouche L, Vanhorebeek I, Vlasselaers D, et al. Intensive insulin therapy protects the endothelium of critically ill patients. *J Clin Invest* 2005; **115**: 2277–86
- Fahy BG, Coursin DB. Critical glucose control: the devil is in the details. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2008; **83**: 394–7
- Kahn R, Gale EA. Gridlocked guidelines for diabetes. *Lancet* 2010; **375**: 2203–4