EDITOR,—Waddington et al are to be congratulated on highlighting the need to provide the best available care to professional footballers. Their paper is, however, inherently blinkered in that it detracts from the validity of their conclusions. For example, they have provided no evidence for their postulation that non-chartered physiotherapists are more vulnerable to threats to their clinical autonomy than those who have. Published quotations from the semistructured interviews are of an emotive nature, and the quoted questions posed by the interviewers are clearly leading. It is well recognised that responses to such interviews can be greatly influenced by the manner in which they are posed.

The authors make no comparison of methods used by chartered and non-chartered physiotherapists, and their outcomes. Similarly there has been no comparison between the performance of club doctors with or without postgraduate qualifications in sports medicine, and, moreover, no evidence produced of actual harm resulting. Indeed, in recent months in Scottish League football, the Dundee club doctor restored circulation to the foot of a player following a serious ankle injury, and the Dumbarton club doctor restarted the breathing of an apnoeic player.

In a recent survey of 15 players in a Scottish football club (unpublished work), 13 stated that they had been discouraged by the (non-chartered) physiotherapist and nine by the (non-specialist) club doctor from training or competing while injured, and none had been encouraged by either to return to playing before complete recovery. Indeed, 10 confessed to concealment of the true severity of injuries, perhaps reflecting the ethos at that particular club.

Care offered to professional footballers merits careful evaluation. However, this should be detailed, methodical, and independent of bias, such as that which can arise when studies are commissioned and funded by interested parties.

CLAIREE HAY
School of Social and Health Sciences
University of Abertay Dundee
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Authors’ reply
We are pleased that our paper on the above subject has generated a lively discussion and in this context we welcome the letters from Rob Mackay and Claire Hay. Both letters raise issues to which we would like to respond.

Dr Mackay appears to accept most of our findings, and the central point of his letter is to “sound a note of caution” before a specialist qualification becomes an essential prerequisite for club doctors. In this regard, Dr Mackay’s “caution”, as he makes clear, is aimed more at Michael Cullen’s commentary on our paper than on the paper itself. In our own paper, we argued that possession of a specialist qualification (or the willingness to study for one) “should be specified as a desirable (although not, in the short term, essential) attribute of candidates for the post of club doctor.

However, it is fair to say that, in the longer term, we would like to move towards a situation in which such a specialist qualification is regarded as essential. Our thinking in this regard is based on a view that is, we think, fairly generally accepted: when seeking any service, whether from a doctor, lawyer, or motor mechanic, it is better—other things being equal—to have that service provided by someone who is more, rather than less, well qualified.

We should emphasise that we do not disagree with Rob Mackay’s suggestion that a background in general practice is appropriate for club doctors; what we do argue is that it would be advantageous if the GP acting as club doctor also had an appropriate specialist qualification in sports medicine in much the same way that the crowd doctor in football is required to hold the Diploma in Intermediate Medical Care.

Robert Mackay does raise an important issue when he suggests that the club doctor who dealt only with the limited range of injuries and illnesses in a single club would be likely to find this insufficiently challenging intellectually. We agree. However, there are two rather different issues involved here. The first is whether a doctor has a specialist qualification; the second issue is whether his (occasionally her) appointment is full time. A full time appointment would indeed present a limited range of clinical problems and may well result in professional dissatisfaction, but we do not argue for full time appointments; rather we argue that those who are appointed (whether full time or part time) should be appropriately qualified. This is a rather different issue.

Claire Hay’s letter is much more critical of our research, suggesting that our paper is “inherently biased”. Before we respond to this general criticism, we would like to respond to the major part of her letter which points out that we make no comparisons of the methods used by chartered and non-chartered physiotherapists and their outcomes, nor do we compare the performance of club doctors who have, and those who do not have, specialist qualifications. She is of course correct, although this is hardly a criticism of our paper, because we made no claim to making such direct comparisons of quality of care. The objects of our study were set out in the title—to examine the qualifications and methods of appointment of club doctors and physiotherapists and to raise some problems and issues relating thereto.

We did. Claire Hay’s claim that uncov- ered physiotherapists and doctors without a specialist qualification can provide good quality care is wholly irrelevant, for we made no claim to the contrary. In so far as any paper can be seen as placing on quality of care issues, it does so only...
indirectly and is based on the point made earlier, namely that other things being equal (and we are aware they often are not equal) it is better to have care provided by practitioners who are more qualified, rather than by those who are less qualified. We do not imagine that Claire Hay would agree with this principle; after all, it is precisely the fact that medical practitioners hold a formal qualification in medicine that differentiates them from lay members of the public.

Claire Hay claims more generally that our paper is “biased” and she goes on to suggest that “published quotations from the semi-structured interviews are of an emotive nature” and that “should have been posed by the interviewer are clearly of a leading nature”. We are at a loss to understand these criticisms. Which quotations does she have in mind? She really needs to be more specific; for our part we have read and reread our article and simply cannot identify any quotations that might properly be considered “emotive”. The quotations that we used from our interviewees were used not with a view to sensationalising our report, but because they reflected a pattern of making appointments that we found repeated again and again in the clubs in which we interviewed.

We are similarly surprised by Claire Hay’s claim that our questions were “clearly of a leading nature”. Which questions does she consider leading? Most of our questions were either open ended, such as “Could you tell me how you got the job as club doctor?” or were straightforward questions such as “Were you interviewed for the post?” or “Do you have a specialist qualification in sports medicine?” Does she regard these as “leading questions”? Most of our questions were consequently the findings from the interviews.

Finally, Claire Hay asserts that the “bias” that she claims to detect in our paper arises from the fact that our study was funded by an interested party, namely the Professional Footballers Association (PFA). She has no evidence for this claim. In fact, all aspects of the research were carried out wholly by us, with no input and certainly no interference from the PFA. The PFA did not even see the interview schedule (neither, incidentally, has the Professional Footballers Association). She has no evidence for this claim. In fact, all aspects of the research were carried out wholly by us, with no input and certainly no interference from the PFA. The PFA did not even see the interview schedule (neither, incidentally, has the Professional Footballers Association).


CALENDAR OF EVENTS

The International 16th Puijo Symposium on Health Related Physical Activity and Fitness in Health Promotion and Medical Care - Evidence-based Exercise Prescription
June 26–29, 2001 in Kuopio, Finland.

Further details: please contact Puijo Symposium Secretariat: Kuopio Research Institute of Exercise Medicine, Haapaniemenkatu 16, FIN-70100 Kuopio, FINLAND, Fax: +358 17 288 4488; email: puijo.symposium@uku.fi Web site: www.uku.fi/conf/puijo

National Athletic Trainers’ Association 52nd Annual Meeting and Clinical Symposia
19–23 June, 2001; Los Angeles Convention Center, Los Angeles, USA

Complete information is available on line through the web site: www.nata.org; fax-on-demand service: +888 275 6285; Tel: +214 637 6282 ext 330.

Canadian Academy of Sport Medicine/Académie Canadienne de Médecine du Sport Annual Symposium and Stampede Sport Medicine Conference 2001
July 4–7, 2001; Calgary, Canada

Learning from the elite athlete: practical applications for the clinician is intended to provide practical education for the clinician regarding common and controversial aspects of sport medicine, as well as to allow the an management of sport medicine problems.

Further details: Mme Jacqueline Burke au bureau national de l’ACMS à Ottawa: Tel: +613 748 5851; Fax: +613 748 5792; email: jburke@CASM-ACMS.org.

Web site: www.casm-acms.org

Sixth IOC World Congress on Sport Sciences
16–23 September, 2001; Salt Lake City, USA
Further details: Michele E. Brown, IOC World Congress Secretariat, Salt Lake Organizing Committee for the 2002 Olympic Games, 299 South Main Street, Suite 1300, P.O. Box 45002, Salt Lake City, UT 84111, USA. Tel: +801 212 3472; Fax: +801 212 2440; email: ioc.worldcongress@saltlake2002.com

Web site: www.ioccworldcongress.org

20th BRUCOSPORT Meeting
19–20 October, 2001; Congress Centre, Brugge, Belgium.


Australian Conference of Science and Medicine in Sport
23–27 October 2001 Burswood International Resort Casino, Perth, Western Australia.

The theme for the 2001 Australian conference is “2001 A Sports Medicine Odyssey: Challenges, Controversies and Change” and will focus on what the future holds for sports medicine, especially following the Sydney Olympic Games.

Further details: Sports Medicine Australia, PO Box 897, Belconnen ACT 2616, Australia. Tel: +61 2 6230 4650; Fax: +61 2 6230 5908; email: smnat@sma.org.au.

Web site: www.sma.org.au

Concussion in Sport
2–3 November 2001; Vienna, Austria.

International symposium organized by the International Ice Hockey Federation (IIHF) in cooperation with the International Olympic Committee Medical Committee, and the Federation Internationale de Football Association Medical Assessment and Research Center (F-MARC).

The conference will present scientific information on the epidemiology, on site management, treatment, grading, and prevention of concussion in sport. Abstract submissions are invited for the Symposium: Deadline 15 June 2001. An abstract submission form can be downloaded in pdf format from the IIHF web site: www.iihf.com.

Further details: Darlene Scheurich, International Ice Hockey Federation (IIHF), Parking 11, 8002 Zurich, Switzerland.

Tel: +41 1 289 8614; Fax: +41 1 2898629; email: scheurich@iihf.com.

II European Federation Sports Medicine Congress
14–17 November 2001; Oviedo, Spain.

Further details: Tel: +34 902 105 873; Fax: +34 902 120 880; email: info@q2c3.com.

www.bjsportmed.com