

**Reference**

1. Sinclair D. Subspecialization in emergency medicine: Where do we go from here? [editorial]. *Can J Emerg Med* 2005;7(5):344-6.

**[The author responds:]**

I thank Drs. Sivilotti and Howes for taking the time to write their thoughtful letter on my Commentary on subspecialization in EM.<sup>1</sup>

I feel that their comments support my Commentary — they clearly state that the essence of emergency practice is the skill to “deftly manage a high acuity, high volume shift.” They also state that “subspecialized emergency physicians continue to function as generalists.”

It is the value of generalist thinking and approach that we must continue to embrace as a specialty. Initially, subspecialists in other fields of medicine also functioned as generalists, but it just became too easy to restrict practice. The emerging literature on the hidden curriculum clearly shows how we devalue generalism in the house of medicine. We can stop the tide from rising!

**Doug Sinclair [a.k.a. King Canute]**

Chief, Emergency Medicine

IWK Health Centre

Halifax, NS

**Reference**

1. Sinclair D. Subspecialization in emergency medicine: Where do we go from here? [editorial]. *Can J Emerg Med* 2005;7(5):344-6.

## **Emergency Medicine is a SPECIALTY. Let's make it that, and not dilute it in order to be PC**

*To the Editor:* I read the Commentary by Adam Lund<sup>1</sup> in the January 2006 issue of *CJEM* with interest, but am puzzled by his closing remarks. Is he im-

plying that there is no distinction between service providers in the ED?

I would agree that subspecialization is something that might not best serve the interests of the EM community at the present time, as it will further splinter an already splintered area of medicine. Now is the time for setting up national standards for training, aiming toward minimum requirement for physicians wanting to practise in EDs, building on the number of certified emergency physicians (whether FR CPC or CCFP-EM), and ultimately aiming for consolidating EM as the SPECIALTY that it is.

I don't believe that EM is best practised by the “available physician.” Completing an EM residency obviously enables one to practise at a different level than someone with no formal training. Even the 1-year residency offered by the CCFP enhances the skill and knowledge level of the physicians to the point that they mostly narrow their practice of medicine to EM. I don't believe that there is a substitute for appropriate supervised training, such as a residency provides. We as a specialty should strive for the ultimate goal of a unified qualification/certification process.

Until there is a shift in the current paradigm, emergency physicians will continue to meet opposition and a lack of recognition from the “established” specialties due to the enormous variability in performance level. And you cannot blame them, since they interface with such a wide variety of competencies — it is no wonder they don't know what a “specialist” in EM is (even though the “specialty” has existed for more than 30 years).

What I would like to see is a set of criteria set forth by CAEP as to what an emergency physician is, and perhaps supplement this by awarding a “FCAEP” to suitable individuals (similar to the FCFP awarded by the College

of Family Physicians of Canada). This would be a start to a process that would hopefully, eventually lead to ONE qualification, ONE type of residency training, and a UNIFIED body of physicians able to practise the “Model of the Clinical Practice of Emergency Medicine”.

**Daniel Bothma, MB, ChB**

Emergency Medicine Specialist

daniel.bothma@vch.ca

**Reference**

1. Lund A. I AM Emergency Medicine [letter]. *Can J Emerg Med* 2006;8(1):4-5.

**[The author responds:]**

Thanks to Dr. Bothma for taking the time to respond to my Letter.<sup>1</sup> I think that this is an important dialogue for our EM community to be having.

Variability is the norm in all areas of medicine. Depending on where one practises, the scope of practice and the sustained range of competence changes. General surgeons practising in more rural areas would be arguably wider in their scope of practice than colleagues in tertiary centres, but less comfortable with certain high acuity/low frequency problems. As such, tertiary groups of surgeons advertise for and attract physicians with more focused/subspecialized general surgery credentials (subspecialty fellowships, research training, etc.) than those sought in smaller communities (Dr. Manoj Raval, Fellowship-trained general surgeon: personal communication, 2006). Not all surgeons are the same, yet all are regarded as specialists.

The practice of EM is arguably even more variable. The emergency needs of communities and hospitals of all sizes call for a broad range of individuals with different skill sets to meet those needs. I feel that it is more productive for us to embrace the whole practice of EM which is, and always will be, prac-