

with the patient when we can do without the time spent in auscultation?

I certainly envision a new cardiovascular physician well versed in all imaging technologies, cost-effectively applied in the quest for the safest and most effective treatment plan of a patient, but I also envision this technology making physical examination teaching much more effective: i.e, what better way to teach a medical student, at the bedside, to hear a Austin-Flint murmur or the presence and timing of a mitral opening snap, then to see (on bedside ultrasound) the aortic regurgitation jet impinging on the anterior leaflet of the mitral valve and the pliable, mobile appearance of the mitral diastolic opening, respectively? Recently, a colleague sent me a patient for a transesophageal evaluation of suspected significant mitral regurgitation after a nonrevealing transthoracic echocardiogram. I listened to the patient and agreed to do it only to find a very eccentric, commissural jet of significant mitral regurgitation which would have gone undetected if my colleague did not know how to hear a holosystolic blowing murmur suggestive of it. Yes, it was advanced technology leading to the diagnosis, but it was careful auscultatory art leading to appropriate use of technology. Auscultation technology has also evolved (2) and promises to remain a critical part of the armamentarium used in physician-patient interaction, both for the detection of disease and for the sake of the interaction itself.

As physicians treating patients and teaching students, we cannot watch disease only, we have to smell it, touch it and especially, hear its music.

Hector I. Michelena, MD

Mayo Clinic
Cardiovascular Diseases
200 First Street SW
Rochester, Minnesota 55905
E-mail: Michelena.hector@mayo.edu

doi:10.1016/j.jcmg.2008.10.013

REFERENCES

1. Chandrasekhar Y, Narula J. *iJACC* in the Evolving World of Integrated Imaging: A Spectator, a Follower, or a Trail Blazer. *J Am Coll Cardiol Img* 2008;1:691-3
2. Tavel M. Cardiac Auscultation A Glorious Past—And It Does Have a Future! *Circulation* 2006;113:1255-9

REPLY

We thank Dr. Michelena for raising an important issue in response to the Editor's Page (1). Being from a sandwich generation, having master clinicians as our teachers and technology-focused fellows and residents as our students, we ourselves cannot but be nostalgic about the lost art of the clinic examination. All of us have had success stories in which we made bedside diagnoses that would have made our master teachers proud. However, in far many more cases, we also remain acutely

aware of our limitations at the bedside. The world of medicine is moving on very briskly and relying exclusively on a very restricted view of what a good clinician can use at the bedside (the touch, the smell, sound, and feel as beautifully described by Dr. Michelena) or cannot use in a complimentary fashion (imaging) is, in our view, unhelpful.

Dr. Michelena's premise is possibly based on subscribing to rather inelastic boundaries for a traditionally defined clinician. In some ways this suggests and "us versus them" scenario; ownership of history and physical exam (and using the stethoscope as its final elegant instrument of proof) to the exclusion of other easily available tools (used by imagers in their dark laboratories and not by clinicians at the bedside). This we feel is an artificial distinction and would argue that easily available imaging is a natural and complimentary extension of day-to-day clinical practice. Thus, the concept of a clinician-imager was emphasized in our proposal. All of us will agree that getting to the correct diagnosis, in the safest and most expeditious manner, is an important goal in clinical medicine. The clinician's right to using only a stethoscope to the exclusion of say, complimentary use of the hand-held ultrasound (when the latter provides far superior information), is rather artificial and possibly sets us up for less-than-optimal patient care.

One of our master clinician-teachers used to often say, "In God we trust but everybody else must show proof." There is much evidence that imaging provides incremental value in the diagnosis and, in fact, a lot of clinical information not supported by imaging data is often reassessed in clinical practice. Therefore, it is likely to anchor the physical exam in the future; the remaining debate in imaging is about more complex issues like societal costs and whether testing changes outcome. However, test performance characteristics of traditional auscultation methods remain mostly untested or dismal when tested, especially in the current training environment (2,3). It is less likely to get better even with seniority (2). We should also appreciate that diseases, once defined only by obvious physical findings or classic symptoms, are now being detected and sometimes treated (e.g., patent foramen ovale in recurrent cryptogenic stroke) very early before such findings appear. Imaging is showing disease where little was suspected clinically (4). Finally, questions (like filling pressures, left ventricular function, viability, risk of sudden death, and so on) are being asked that are outside the ambit of traditional touch, smell, sound, or feel. One would suspect that even Leatham, Wood, and Harvey would approvingly allow easily available imaging techniques into their clinical armamentarium if they practiced today.

Of course, this assumes an optimally obtained imaging study. The issues of training requirements and test performance at the bedside would need to be standardized to reap the maximum benefits from powerful imaging modalities. Nevertheless, in our view, these issues are manageable and possibly inevitable given the push to quality in clinical medicine. Unless unexpected changes in economics play an adverse role in the development of miniaturized technology, imaging that makes "believing" more

possible is destined to play an increasingly useful role at the bedside.

Y. Chandrashekhar, MD, DM, FACC

***Jagat Narula, MD, PhD, FACC**

*Editor-in-Chief, *JACC: Cardiovascular Imaging*

3655 Nobel Drive, Suite 630

San Diego, California 92112

E-mail: narula@uci.edu

doi:10.1016/j.jcmg.2008.12.004

REFERENCES

1. Chandrashekhar Y, Narula J. *iJACC* in the evolving world of integrated imaging: a spectator, a follower, or a trail blazer. *J Am Coll Cardiol Img* 2008;1:691-3.
2. Mangione S, Nieman L, Gracely E, Kaye D. The teaching and practice of cardiac auscultation during internal medicine and cardiology training. *Ann Intern Med* 1993;119:47-54.
3. Shaver JA. Cardiac auscultation: a cost-effective diagnostic skill. *Curr Probl Cardiol* 1995;20:441-532.
4. Marijon E, Ou P, Celermajer DS, et al. Prevalence of rheumatic heart disease detected by echocardiographic screening. *N Engl J Med* 2007; 357:470-6.