Points & Pearls

• The original validation trial and multiple subsequent studies (Stiell 2001, Stiell 2005, Stiell 2010) each found the high-risk criteria of the Canadian CT (computed tomography) Head Rule (CCHR) to be 100% sensitive for injuries requiring neurosurgical intervention. The CCHR has an 87% to 100% sensitivity for detecting “clinically important” brain injuries that do not require neurosurgery.

• The rule excluded patients who were taking oral anticoagulants and antiplatelet agents, so no data are available for these patients.

• Patients with minimal head injury (ie, no history of loss of consciousness, amnesia, and confusion) generally do not need a CT scan. For example, patients aged > 65 years may not need a CT scan just based on age if they do not have the history mentioned above.

• When a patient fails the CCHR, use clinical judgment on whether a CT scan is necessary.

• One study (Harnan 2011) found the CCHR to be the most consistent, validated, and effective clinical decision rule for minor head injury patients.

• While there is only 1 United States validation study for the CCHR, it was 100% sensitive for clinically important injuries and injuries requiring neurosurgery. A retrospective study in the United Kingdom found that applying the CCHR would have actually resulted in an increase in the number of patients undergoing CT scans in that particular practice setting. There is debate about whether the goal should be to find all intracranial injuries or to find patient-important ones that would require neurosurgical intervention.

Critical Actions

The CCHR has been validated in multiple settings and has been consistently demonstrated to be 100% sensitive for detecting injuries that will require neurosurgery. Depending on practice environment, it may not be considered acceptable to miss any intracranial injuries, regardless of whether they would have required intervention.

Providers may want to consider applying the New Orleans Criteria for head trauma, as there has been at least 1 trial finding it to be more sensitive than the CCHR for detecting clinically significant intracranial injuries (99.4% vs 87.3%), though this comes at the price of markedly decreased specificity (5.6% vs 39.7%). Furthermore, there are other trials in which the CCHR was found to be more sensitive than the New Orleans Criteria for detecting clinically important brain injuries.

Evidence Appraisal

The validation study (Stiell 2005) included a convenience sample of 2702 patients aged ≥ 16 years, who presented to 9 Canadian emergency departments with blunt head trauma resulting in witnessed loss of consciousness, disorientation, or definite amnesia and a Glasgow Coma Scale score of 13 to 15. Within the sample, 8.5% (231/2707) of the patients had a clinically important brain injury, and
Why to Use
There are more than 8 million patients who present annually to emergency departments in the United States for evaluation of head trauma. The vast majority of these patients have minor head trauma that will not require specialized or neurosurgical treatment. At the same time, rates of CT imaging of the head more than doubled from 1995 to 2007.

When to Use
• Apply the CCHR only to patients with GCS scores of 13-15 with loss of consciousness, amnesia to the head injury event, and confusion.
• Do not use in patients aged < 16 years, patients on blood thinners, or patients with seizure after injury.
• The CCHR is a well-validated clinical decision aid that allows physicians to safely rule out the presence of intracranial injuries that would require neurosurgical intervention, without the need for CT imaging.
• The CCHR has been found to be 70% sensitive for “clinically important” brain injury in alcohol-intoxicated patients (Easter 2013).

Next Steps
• Remember to always discuss postconcussive symptoms and management with the patient, especially if he or she is being discharged without a head CT. Otherwise, a patient who feels postconcussive symptoms may worry that a CT was needed.
• Educating patients on the symptoms of injuries that require neurosurgical intervention versus postconcussive symptoms can help them feel empowered and reassured.

Other References
Journals with Multi-Media Training

Emergency Medicine Practice, published 12 times per year in a multi-media format, provides diagnosis techniques and treatment recommendations that can be applied immediately and reliably to your practice. Written by practicing, experienced ED physicians, Emergency Medicine Practice can boost your clinical confidence, refresh your memory of the fundamentals, and keep you abreast of the most relevant updates in emergency medicine.

An annual subscription now includes print issues, full online access to archived issues, CME, and so much more! You also receive our exclusive Points & Pearls supplement (a 2-page digest of each issue), the companion podcast (Emplify), and our new Calculated Decisions supplement (including links to MDCalc’s risk scores and calculators you can use in real time!).

Price: $349 (group rates available) CME: 48 credits Format: Print, Online, & More

Pediatric Emergency Medicine Practice is the leading evidence-based resource that gives you concise, applicable information on the management of pediatric patients. Whether you work in a pediatric ED or a general ED, knowledge of appropriate diagnosis and management of pediatric emergencies is critical to delivering optimal patient care.

An annual subscription now includes print issues, full online access to archived issues, CME, and so much more! You also receive our exclusive Points & Pearls supplement (a 2-page digest of each issue), the companion podcast (Emplify Pediatrics—coming soon), and our new Calculated Decisions supplement (including links to MDCalc’s risk scores and calculators you can use in real time!).

Price: $319 (group rates available) CME: 48 credits Format: Print, Online, & More

To order: call 1.800.249.5770 or visit www.ebmedicine.net