Resident are right, and I am confused:
A short story

Kathleen Powell-Mattioli, MD; Lata M. Gupta, MD; Alixandra Crepeau, MD; Suneet P. Chauhan, MD

As the new clinician at Aurora Health Care, I was volunteered for a didactic sessions with the residents. They were eager and enthusiastic to start; I was comfortable and confident discussing the topic: aberrant amniotic fluid.

Just like my grandfather, who taught in India in the last century, I walked up to the black board and outlined the discussion for the next hour:
- Definition
- Incidence
- Risk Factors
- Diagnosis
- Management options

Looking in the residents’ insatiable eyes, I asked, “Who can tell me what oligohydramnios is?”

Five hands were raised instantly.

I knew they were prepared and that I was blessed being in an academic center.

Before I could ask for a volunteer, someone said: “Amniotic fluid index less than 5.0 cm.”

“No, amniotic fluid index of 5.0 cm or less,” corrected another one, adding, “it was in one of the old ER episodes, where the mother died during the Zavanelli maneuver.” The few who recalled the show nodded in agreement; others scoffed, while one muttered, “Whatever.”

“It depends on the gestational age,” someone else said.

“Actually it is no pocket of amniotic fluid of 1 cm or 2 cm,” said the foreign graduate resident.

The fifth resident trumped everyone by quoting ACOG: “The practice bulletin on post-term pregnancy states oligohydramnios is no measurable vertical pocket more than 2-3 cm.”

“Wow! Holy cow.” I exclaimed.

“If we cannot even agree on the definition, how can we talk about the abnormal condition?” Dismissing the rest of didactic session in frustration, I assigned them a task: In a tabular form, present the definitions of oligohydramnios and hydramnios from the textbooks they rely on and then we would continue the discussion.

Definitions of oligohydramnios and hydramnios

One wonderful Wisconsin winter morning, 3 residents gathered in my office and brought a table. They were late with the assignment, but it was finally done.
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“We would have done this sooner, but the work hour restriction...” said one of them.

“We’re always cognizant and compliant with the 80 hour work week,” chimed another, with a mischievous smile.

In rapid-fire succession, they explained how they made the table. One of them took the Compendium 2005 as well as 1 of the textbooks, and the other 3 each took their favorite textbook. They examined the subject index in the back of the 4 sources and read all the pages that referenced “oligohydramnios,” “hydramnios,” and “polyhydramnios.”

Dazed and confused, I realized that our residents, no, the co-authors of this short story, were right: There are multiple definitions of aberrant amniotic fluid in respectful textbooks and ACOG practice bulletins.

“What is correct?” the quiet resident asked.

“We can use whichever we like,” the second one said.

“Or on Monday, it can be amniotic fluid index <5.0 cm and on Tuesday, deepest pocket <1 cm...” the third one added and then stopped herself at her own suggestion.

“What would you like us to do?” the 3 asked, after a long pause, in a chorus. “What should we do?”

“Write a short story,” is all I could think of to say.

When the 3 of them were down the hallway, I heard one of them say, “We will never get the credit for this story.”

“And don’t worry,” one said as the elevator door opened. “No one has published anything meaningful from this hospital.”

Alone in the office, I reviewed the table, as the elevator door closed on my head, and all I could think

Author Affiliations: Aurora Health Care, West Allis, Wis.

Corresponding Author: Suneet P. Chauhan, MD, Aurora Health Care, 8901 W Lincoln Ave, PAC, West Allis, WI 53227; phone 414.329.5647; fax 414.329.5928; e-mail suneet.chauhan@aurora.org.

Wisconsin Medical Journal • 2007 • Volume 106, No. 4

183
of was: Perhaps precise thresholds for differentiating normal and abnormal conditions are unnecessary. But what about the concept of likelihood ratios and the guidelines established by the Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group. Forget the randomized controlled trials on the topic because it will be years before they are discussed in the textbooks. There will never be a consensus on this topic. If there were no agreement on the definition, how would we agree on the management of aberrant fluid? The last thought, before the elevator door slammed against my head again, was: If there are such fundamental differences on this topic, how often are the textbooks different on other subjects in obstetrics?
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