Clinical Guidelines and the Law: Negligence, Discretion and Judgment


This book could not be more timely. The white paper,1 which will lead to the establishment of clinical governance, national framework standards, and the promotion of clinical excellence through a national institute, presents a challenge to the legal status of clinical guidelines and the clinical judgment of the doctor. Not that the issue of the status of clinical guidelines in relation to clinical judgment and freedom of the doctor is new. As the author points out, it was a subject of concern to Plato, who explored with his students the difference between skills grounded in practical expertise and those based merely upon instruction or obeying rules. The book is extensively researched and referenced and covers in six short chapters topics relating to: the nature and context of clinical guidance; the authority and validity of clinical guidelines; the legal status of clinical guidelines; clinical guidelines and negligence case law; author liability and clinical discretion; and clinical judgment and clinical freedom. Appendices give fuller details of some of the key cases, and there is a synopsis of significant articles taken from the UK, the Commonwealth and the USA. A foreword by Sir Douglas Black emphasises the importance of the topic. This is a readable and enlightening book, well illustrated by examples from clinical practice, thought-provoking, clear, and comprehensive. For clarity, the main points are summarised at the end of each chapter.

The author explains clearly and with authority the varied ways in which protocols, procedures, practices, and guidelines come into existence. He says 5,000 statements are issued annually by the National Health Service (NHS) executive and other health service agencies, consisting of guidance, executive letters and official instructions. To these must be added the textbooks and articles from medical researchers on appropriate clinical practice. Not all clinical guidelines should be approved and the author lists ten key characteristics which they should possess to be acceptable. He could perhaps have added ethical acceptability to these. Appropriate examples are given of the establishment of clinical guidelines and their variety, and the circumstances in which they may be ignored.

In reviewing the legal status of clinical guidelines in the UK he shows that the Bolam test, albeit battered and refined by the Bolitho case, ensures that clinical judgment is still protected if it is in accordance with reasonable competent practice. A doctor is not negligent just because he/she has not followed a guideline, but conversely he/she may be negligent if he/she has followed a guideline without relevance to the particular circumstances of the patient. However, as guideline-informed health care increasingly becomes customary, there will be more pressure for the doctor who acts outside guidelines to prove justification from the specific circumstances of the case.

The author also considers the liability of the authors and propagators of clinical guidelines, concluding that if they suggest the advice they give should not be adopted “without independent inquiry” then this might act as a sufficient disclaimer in the event of any action for negligence.

The book should become compulsory reading for all those whose task it will be, in the post-white-paper era, to implement the effect of the results from clinical effectiveness studies, national framework standards and the work of the Commission for Health Improvements. Thus health service managers, contractors, providers, and professionals drawing up protocols should be familiar with the complexity of the subject and the dangers. The book will not provide the answers, but it will ensure that the draughtsmen realise the significance in both law and practice of the protocols and procedures which they design. Expert witnesses in the period following the Woolf reforms should also be familiar with this book and be hesitant to condemn practice for the sole reason that the usual guidelines were not followed.

Doctors will never become robots. Medicine will always be both an art and a science and clinical freedom to ensure that the individual patient is given the appropriate treatment for his personal needs is essential. At the same time, the patient must be protected from unacceptable practice, such as that recently seen in Bristol in the provision of paediatric cardiac surgery. The dangers of health care prac-