

Complementary and Alternative Medicine Practitioners' Standard of Care: Responsibilities to Patients and Parents

abstract

In this article we explain (1) the standard of care that health care providers must meet and (2) how these principles apply to complementary and alternative medicine practitioners. The scenario describes a 14-year-old boy who is experiencing back pain and whose chiropractor performed spinal manipulation but did not recognize or take steps to rule out serious underlying disease—in this case, testicular cancer—either initially or when the patient's condition continued to deteriorate despite treatment. We use chiropractic care for a patient with a sore back as an example, because back pain is such a common problem and chiropractic is a common treatment chosen by both adult and pediatric patients. The scenario illustrates the responsibilities that complementary and alternative medicine practitioners owe patients/parents, the potential for liability when deficient care harms patients, and the importance of ample formal pediatric training for practitioners who treat pediatric patients. *Pediatrics* 2011;128:S200–S205

AUTHORS: Joan Gilmour, LLB, JSD,^a Christine Harrison, MA, PHD,^b Leyla Asadi, MD,^c Michael H. Cohen, JDA, MBA,^d and Sunita Vohra, MD, MSc^{e,f}

^aOsgoode Hall Law School, York University, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; ^bDepartment of Bioethics, SickKids Hospital, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; ^cDepartments of Medicine and ^dPediatrics, Faculty of Medicine, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada; ^eFenton Nelson LLP, Los Angeles, California; and ^fCARE Program for Integrative Health & Healing, Stollery Children's Hospital, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

KEY WORDS

complementary therapies, legal liability, evidence-based practice, clinical competence

ABBREVIATION

CAM—complementary and alternative medicine

www.pediatrics.org/cgi/doi/10.1542/peds.2010-2720J

doi:10.1542/peds.2010-2720J

Address correspondence to Sunita Vohra, MD, MSc, Edmonton General Hospital, 8B19-11111 Jasper Ave, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T5K 0L4. E-mail: svohra@ualberta.ca

PEDIATRICS (ISSN Numbers: Print, 0031-4005; Online, 1098-4275).

Copyright © 2011 by the American Academy of Pediatrics

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE: The authors have indicated they have no financial relationships relevant to this article to disclose.

Michael is a 14-year-old boy who complains of new-onset back pain with no known precipitating cause that limits his activities and wakes him from sleep. He visits his mother's chiropractor, who takes a history, completes a physical examination, and concludes that Michael has a misaligned spine. He performs spinal manipulation on Michael during 12 visits over a 6-week period. When Michael begins to complain of increasing pain and fatigue, the chiropractor suggests that they are likely to be adverse responses to the spinal manipulation and recommends nutritional supplements and relaxation techniques for improvements to his overall health. Michael's mother takes her son to his pediatrician for a second opinion. On examination, the pediatrician discovers that Michael has lost 5 kg in the past month and has a mass lesion in his left scrotum. Additional testing confirms the suspicion of testicular cancer and also reveals lung and retroperitoneal nodal metastases. A unilateral inguinal orchiectomy is performed, and it is determined that Michael has a nonseminomatous testicular tumor. Combination chemotherapy is quickly initiated.

Testicular cancer is not a common cancer, but it is the most common malignancy in males between the ages of 15 and 35 years. Of patients with disseminated disease, ~25% initially present with symptoms that arise from the metastasis and not the primary tumor.¹ Back pain is the most common symptom of metastatic disease.²

Many people suffer from back pain, although relatively few of them have cancer. They may consult conventional, complementary and alternative medicine (CAM), or a combination of health care providers to find relief. In a large 2007 survey, the most common reason for which American adults used CAM

was for back pain; back or neck pain was also the second-most common reason that young people did so.³ Chiropractic is one of the most established CAM therapies. It is a regulated health profession in all jurisdictions in Canada and is licensed in every US state.^{4,5} Because back pain is such a common problem and chiropractic is a common response, we use it here to illustrate the responsibilities that CAM practitioners have to patients/parents and the potential for liability when deficient care harms patients. In this article we (1) explain the standard of care health care that providers must meet and (2) examine how these principles apply to CAM providers.

ETHICS

Canadian chiropractors are required by their code of ethics to “recognize the limitations of [their] expertise, and when indicated, will recommend to a patient that additional options and services be obtained.”⁶ Smith⁷ has suggested that chiropractors have an ethical duty to understand the limits of their own competence and those of the profession. Pearle⁸ cautioned that chiropractors should be knowledgeable about the current literature and research, in part so they may recognize the limits to their own abilities. This ethical obligation is common to all health care providers.

LAW

In the introductory article of this supplemental issue of *Pediatrics*⁹ we explain the legal duty of care that health practitioners owe their patients and outline what a plaintiff must prove to succeed in a negligence action. In this article we focus on one aspect of clinicians' obligations: the legal standard of care owed to patients and how it is determined.

CAM Practitioners' Standard of Care

Regulated/Recognized CAM Practitioners

When considering the more widely recognized CAM therapies such as chiropractic, US and Canadian courts judge practitioners by the standard appropriate to their discipline,^{10–13} that is, standards that “conform to [their] education, training, and peer expectations.”¹⁴ (pp235–236) Courts have articulated the standard of care to which chiropractors are held in the same terms that apply to physicians: “that degree of care, diligence, judgment and skill which is exercised by a reasonable chiropractor under like or similar circumstances.”^{15–19}

Principles generally applicable when determining medical liability apply to these CAM practitioners as well.^{18,20} Departure from approved practice, although not negligence per se, may underpin a finding of negligence if it is shown that what occurred was not something a reasonable practitioner would have done in similar circumstances.^{14,18} Breach of professional or clinical guidelines or policies, or failure to comply with regulatory requirements, may also provide evidence of negligence.^{21,22} When determining the professional standard of care, courts will consider expert evidence of other practitioners in that field,²³ applicable legislation, regulations, policy statements, and guidelines issued by regulatory bodies or professional associations, and judicial decisions on previous cases.^{19,21,24,25}

When a chiropractor undertakes a patient's care, he or she must investigate the cause of the patient's complaint or condition to determine if chiropractic treatment could benefit the patient and to formulate a treatment plan. Health care professionals are not expected to meet a standard of perfec-

tion; they can make errors in judgment without being found negligent unless the error is one that falls below the standard of care (ie, that a reasonable practitioner in that field would not have made in similar circumstances).^{10,12,14} When a patient's clinical condition warrants (eg, continued or unexpected deterioration or the onset of new symptoms), the practitioner should consider other possible explanations. The diagnosis or assessment may have to be reconsidered, and treatment changed or a referral made, as appropriate.^{14,26,29} Treatment determined to be ineffective should be discontinued. In both Canada and the United States, nonmedical providers (whether allied health or CAM) may have a duty to refer the patient when it becomes apparent that the patient's condition exceeds the provider's skill and training.^{14,19,27–30} Referral must be timely to avoid delaying needed care.

In some circumstances, courts do not use the previously described professional standard to judge the care provided.²⁰ When conventional, CAM, or allied health practitioners act outside the scope of practice legally permitted or generally accepted by peer practitioners, the underlying justification for judging them by standards that conform to their education, training, and peer expectations would no longer hold.^{20,31} Consequently, a professional standard of care would be inappropriate. In addition, a heightened standard of care may be imposed when clinicians' areas of knowledge or treatment overlap; expert evidence from conventional practitioners not trained in the discipline concerned may be relied on to establish standards of practice applicable to diagnosis or treatment.^{20,27} In the United States, Cohen gave an example of chiropractors being authorized by law to take radiographs, conduct urinalysis, order blood and other routine laboratory

tests, or perform physical examinations; failure to do so "may be judged against a biomedical standard of care, and constitute malpractice."^{19(p230),32} Finally, Canadian cases have not uniformly recognized the validity of differing "schools of opinion" regarding diagnosis.³³ However, courts increasingly accept that diagnoses may legitimately vary among systems of health care on the basis of different principles (provided the health system itself does not fall below the standard of care).^{20,34,35} This is consistent with growing state acceptance of different types of CAM, evidenced by their inclusion in regulatory regimes governing health professions and statutory recognition of their separate scopes of practice and distinct forms of diagnosis.

Unregulated/Less Recognized CAM Providers

Many types of CAM are neither as well recognized nor as integrated into the health care regulatory system as chiropractic. Less well-accepted types of practitioners may not be recognized as a profession or share a common practice.^{19,36} Courts will enforce statutory prohibitions on unauthorized practice,^{37,38} but beyond that, judicial guidance about the standard of care applicable to these types of CAM providers is scarce.^{19,39,40} A 2000 English case, *Shakoor v Situ*, is one of the few to have addressed this issue.³⁵ The patient died of acute liver failure, a rare reaction to an herbal remedy prescribed for his skin condition by the defendant, a practitioner of traditional Chinese herbal medicine. Articles in orthodox medical journals had suggested that the remedy carried a risk of liver damage. The defendant was unaware of these articles; he believed the remedy safe in light of Chinese medical textbooks. The court concluded that because the defendant did not hold himself out as practicing conventional

medicine and the patient had rejected the only conventional medical treatment (surgery), his treatment should not be judged by the standards of conventional medicine. However, he was held to the standard of a physician in general practice when assessing what he knew or should have known about the safety of the remedies he prescribed. He was ultimately not held liable, because the court found the medical literature too equivocal to put a reasonably competent physician on notice that the remedy was too hazardous to use. Although foreign judgments are not binding on courts in other countries, this decision reinforces the extent of clinicians' duty to take account of relevant findings from conventional biomedicine, reevaluate and modify their practices accordingly in light of reported adverse events and clinical experience, and ensure that remedies they recommend or provide are safe or, at least, that they make patients aware of the risk of harm.

If a health practitioner is sued for negligence and a common professional standard of care among practitioners cannot be identified or is not accepted, courts have judged the care provided by either (1) the standard of the reasonable person^{20,41} (who presumably should limit care to that appropriate to a layperson) or (2) accepted medical standards (because the person represented himself or herself as being skilled in healing).^{14,20,36,41–43} Practitioners must recognize the limits of their capabilities.⁴⁴

Informed Consent and CAM Practitioners

Failure to obtain informed consent to treatment is a breach of practitioners' standard of care regardless of whether the therapy is conventional or alternative. As part of obtaining informed consent to chiropractic care, clinicians must provide patients with

material information about their condition, the treatment proposed, alternatives to the treatment, and material, special, or unusual risks associated with the various options.^{19,44–48} Patients/parents should be given the information that a reasonable person in similar circumstances would want to know to make an informed decision about treatment, which should include general information about the practitioner's approach to health care and diagnosis, particularly if it departs from the mainstream, and discussion of what is known about the efficacy of the treatment proposed.

CLINICAL RESPONSE

The US Centers for Disease Control have estimated that 2.8% of American children received chiropractic treatment for various conditions in 2007, and an Australian study found rates as high as 34%.^{3,49} Although there is evidence that chiropractic treatment can be effective in treating lower back pain in adults,^{50,51} there are few data specifically pertaining to pediatric chiropractic despite its popularity for children.

Data on adverse events related to pediatric chiropractic are scarce. We identified 4 pediatric reviews. Most recently, a 2010 update of clinical research literature in the 2007 Vohra et al review, in which no serious adverse events were identified.⁵² Also, a 3-year retrospective study of pediatric case files from a teaching clinic practice did not reveal any serious complications from 781 case files.⁵³ Before that, results of a narrative review suggested that the risk of complications from chiropractic manipulation in pediatric patients is 1 in 250 million visits.⁵⁴ Vohra et al⁵⁵ suggested that this study potentially underestimated the risk, because most harms are not reported. Their systematic review identified 14 cases of direct adverse events; more

pertinent to this scenario, they also identified 20 cases of “delayed diagnosis and/or inappropriate provision of chiropractic care” that indirectly caused adverse events. They considered even this number an underestimate, as it was not the focus of their systematic review.⁵⁵ Seven of the indirect adverse events involved delayed treatment of cancer.

Some conditions clearly indicate potential serious risk to health and require immediate referral for conventional medical care. In pediatrics, persistent systematic symptoms of back pain that interferes with sleep and leads to self-imposed activity limitations are considered a “red flag” for serious disease that warrants immediate further evaluation with at least a plain radiograph.⁵⁶ Our scenario raises questions about both the reasonableness of the initial diagnosis and the failure to investigate further or consider other diagnoses given the patient's condition and response to treatment, as well as the point at which the patient should have been referred for medical care and chiropractic treatment ended. A judgment about whether this practitioner fell below the standard of care because he misdiagnosed the condition or because he failed to recognize that the patient required different expertise and referral to a physician will depend on expert and other evidence about the standard of care.

Incorporating more formal training about pediatric care into chiropractors' education could reduce the risk of adverse events caused by delays in diagnosis or referral for needed care.^{55,57,58} Treatments for testicular cancer have improved, so despite the progress of the disease to lung metastasis, there is still a >90% cure rate.⁵⁹ Nevertheless, the delay in diagnosis could very well be linked with an advance in the stage of the tumor, the

need for longer, more aggressive therapy, and greater physical and psychological adverse effects.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Scope of Practice

Clinicians should ensure that they have the necessary knowledge, skills, and training to treat the patient's condition, comply with regulatory and institutional policies, and are legally authorized to provide the treatment proposed in the jurisdiction in which they practice.^{60,61}

Standard of Care

Thorough history-taking, investigation, and record-keeping are essential, as is an appropriate physical examination when pertinent to the patient's presenting complaint.

Clinicians must exercise reasonable care, skill, and judgment in diagnosing the condition, explaining results to patients, and reconsidering diagnosis and treatment when circumstances warrant.

Clinicians must be sure to obtain informed consent for treatment and tell patients when their condition is not amenable to the type of treatment they provide.¹⁹

The patient's condition should be monitored appropriately during treatment, and treatment should be altered (with consent) as needed. Treatment determined to be ineffective should be discontinued.

Referral is indicated when the clinician cannot diagnose or assess the patient's condition, the patient's condition is not responsive to treatment, the patient needs treatment that the clinician is not competent or authorized to provide, the clinician cannot continue to treat the patient, or the clinician is insufficiently experienced to treat the patient.^{10,19,62–64} Referral must be timely

to ensure that needed care is not delayed.

Education

Clinicians who treat children should have ample formal pediatric training to provide better and safer care to their youngest patients. Best-practice recommendations for pediatric chiropractic care (based on expert opinion, because high-quality research evidence is lacking) were published in 2009.⁶⁵

Adverse Events and Patient Safety

Improving patient safety and reducing error have become priorities in health care.^{66–69} When adverse events occur, it is essential to assess what went wrong to learn how to avoid such occurrences in the future. Regulatory au-

thorities and professional associations should develop programs to improve safety and quality of care and alert members about preventable adverse events (eg, an advisory guideline that outlines the association between back pain and cancer in young men and adolescents).

Continuing education (eg, through educational programs, journal clubs, or self-study) is important to ensure that practitioners learn about new developments and reported adverse events so they can modify their practices as needed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Funding for this project was partially provided by the SickKids Foundation (Toronto, Ontario, Canada). Dr Vohra

received salary support from the Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

We thank Dr Paul Grundy and an anonymous pediatric chiropractic reviewer for comments on this article; all errors and omissions remain our own. We also gratefully acknowledge the contributions of Soleil Surette and Alison Henry for help in literature searching and manuscript preparation, Maya Goldenberg and Andrew Milroy for bioethics research assistance, and Osgoode Hall Law School students (now graduates) Nicola Simmons, David Vitale, Kristine Bitterman, and Janet Chong for assistance with legal research.

REFERENCES

1. Bosl G. Impact of delay in diagnosis on clinical stage of testicular cancer. *Lancet*. 1981; 2(8253):970–973
2. Holland JF, ed. *Cancer Medicine*. Hamilton, Ontario, Canada: B.C. Decker; 2000
3. Barnes PM, Bloom B, Nahin RL. Complementary and alternative medicine use among adults and children: United States, 2007. *Natl Health Stat Report*. 2008;(12):1–23. Available at: www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr012.pdf. Accessed August 10, 2010
4. Casey JT. *The Regulation of Professions in Canada*. Scarborough, Ontario, Canada: Carswell; 1994
5. Cohen M, Hrbek A, Davis R, Schachter S, Eisenberg D. Emerging credentialing practices, malpractice liability policies, and guidelines governing complementary and alternative medical practices and dietary supplement restrictions. *Arch Intern Med*. 2005;165(3):289–295
6. Canadian Chiropractic Association. Code of ethics and conduct: article I—duties of the chiropractor to the patient: section 2. Available at: www.chiropracticcanada.ca/en-us/AboutUs/TheCCA/CodeofEthics.aspx. Accessed July 13, 2010
7. Smith JC. Chiropractic ethics: an oxymoron? Contemporary ethical issues in chiropractic. *J Chiropr Humanit*. 2000;9. Available at: <http://archive.journalchirohumanities.com/Vol%209/SmithComtemp.pdf>. Accessed July 13, 2010
8. Pearle S. Chiropractic ethics in a changing world. *J Am Chiropr Assoc*. 2003;40(6): 10–12, 14–19
9. Gilmour J, Harrison C, Cohen M, Vohra S. Pediatric use of complementary and alternative medicine: legal, ethical, and clinical issues in decision-making. *Pediatrics*. 2011; 128(5 pt 4):S149–S154
10. Studdert D, Eisenberg D, Miller F, Curto D, Kaptchuk T, Brennan T. Medical malpractice implications of alternative medicine. *JAMA*. 1998;280(18):1610–1615
11. Cohen M, Eisenberg D. Potential physician malpractice liability associated with complementary and integrative medicine therapies. *Ann Intern Med*. 2002;136(8):596–603
12. *Lapointe v Hopital Le Gardeur* (1992), 90 DLR (4th) 7 (SCC)
13. *Carere v Cressman* (2002), OJ No. 1496 (SC) (midwifery)
14. Picard E, Robertson G. *Legal Liability of Doctors and Hospitals in Canada*. 4th ed. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Carswell; 2007
15. *Barber v Wilson* (1996), OJ No. 253 (Gen Div)
16. *Collin v Jasek* (2000), Carswell Ont 2845 (2000), OJ No. 3023 (SC), additional reasons at 2000 Carswell Ont 3297
17. *Heughan v Sheppard* (2000), Carswell Ont 2037 (2000), OJ No. 2188 (SC)
18. Studdert D. Legal issues in the delivery of alternative medicine. *J Am Med Womens Assoc*. 1999;54(4):173–176
19. Cohen M. Malpractice in complementary and alternative medicine: practical implications for risk managers. In: Faas N, ed. *Integrating Complementary Medicine Into Health Systems*. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen; 2001:226–234
20. Crouch R, Elliott R, Lemmens T, Charland L. *Complementary/Alternative Health Care and AIDS: Legal, Ethical and Policy Issues in Regulation*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network; 2001
21. Campbell A, Cranley Glass K. The legal status of clinical and ethics policies, codes and guidelines in medical practice and research. *McGill Law J*. 2001;46(2):473–489
22. Cohen M. *Beyond Complementary Medicine: Legal and Ethical Perspectives on Health Care and Human Evolution*. Ann Arbor, MI; University of Michigan Press; 2000
23. *ter Neuzen v Korn* (1995), 3 SCR 674
24. Acupuncture Regulation, Alta Reg 42/88, made under the Health Disciplines Act, R.S.A. 2000, c.H-2, Sch. G
25. Traditional Chinese Medicine and Acupuncturists Regulation, BC Reg 290/2008, made under the Health Professions Act, R.S.B.C. 1996, c. 183
26. *Tschirhart v Pethel* (1975), 233 NW 2d 93,94 (MichCtApp)
27. *Williams (Litigation Guardian of) v Bowler* (2005), OJ No. 3323
28. Cohen M. *Complementary and Alternative Medicine: Legal Boundaries and Regulatory Perspectives*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press; 1998

29. *Kerman v Hintz* (1998), 418 NW 2d 795, 802-3 (Wis 1998)
30. *Mostrom v Pettibon* (1980), 607 P 2d 864 (Wash App Ct)
31. *Gallacher v Jameson Estate* (2002), OJ No. 2699, 2002 Carswell Ont 2230 (SC)
32. Hobson S. The standard of admissibility of a physician's expert testimony in a chiropractic malpractice action (1989), 64 Ind LJ 737, 741-742
33. *Gibbons v Harris* (1924), 1 DLR 923, at 925, 929 (Alta CA)
34. *Penner v Theobald* (1962), 35 DLR (2d) 700 (Man CA) at 706, 708
35. *Shakoor v Situ* (2001), 1 WLR 410 (2000), 4 All ER 181, 57 BMLR 178 (QB)
36. Hawkins P, Ghosn J. Alternative therapies. In: Borden Ladner Gervais LLP *Canadian Health Law Practice Manual*. Looseleaf ed (incl 2009service issues). Markham, Ontario, Canada: LexisNexis; 2000
37. Furrow B, Greaney T, Johnson S, Jost T, Schwartz R. *Health Law*. 6th ed. St Paul, MN; Thomson West; 2008
38. *College of Midwives of BC v Lemay* (2003), BCJ No. 2510 (BCCA)
39. *Robinson v Chin* (1999), BCJ No. 2290 (SC)
40. *Auch v Wolfe* (2003), MJ No. 130 (QB) (herbalist)
41. Vlasis R. The doctor is out, or unconventional methods for healing: resolving the standard of care for an alternative medicine practitioner. *Houston Law Rev*. 2006; 43(2):495-525
42. Caulfield T, Feasby C. Potions, promises and paradoxes: complementary and alternative medicine and malpractice law in Canada. *Health Law J*. 2001;9:183-203
43. Feasby C. Determining the standard of care in alternative contexts. *Health Law J*. 1997; 5:45-65
44. *Forgie v Mason* (1986), 38 CCLT 171 (NBCA), leave to appeal denied 76 NR 397n (SCC) (chiropractors)
45. *Reibl v Hughes* (1980), 2 SCR 880 (physicians)
46. *Zimmer v Ringrose* (1981), 4 WWR 75 (Alta CA) (physician's innovative therapy)
47. Health Care Consent Act, being Sch. 2 to the Advocacy, Consent and Substitute Decisions Statute Law Amendment Act, S.O. 1996, c. 2, s. 11
48. Cohen M. The role of informed consent in the delivery of complementary and alternative medical therapies. In: Faas N, ed. *Integrating Complementary Medicine Into Health Systems*. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen; 2001:235-239
49. Smith C, Eckert K. Prevalence of complementary and alternative medicine and use among children in South Australia. *J Paediatr Child Health*. 2006;42(9):538-543
50. Assendelft WJJ, Morton SC, Yu EI, Suttorp MJ, Shekelle PG. Spinal manipulative therapy for low-back pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2004;(1):CD000447
51. Wilkey A, Gregory M, Byfield D, McCarthy PW. A comparison between chiropractic management and pain clinic management for chronic low-back pain in a National Health Service outpatient clinic. *J Altern Complement Med*. 2008;14(5):465-473
52. Humphreys BK. Possible adverse events in children treated by manual therapy: a review. *Chiropr Osteopat*. 2010;18:12
53. Miller JE, Benfield K. Adverse effects of spinal manipulative therapy in children younger than 3 years: a retrospective study in a chiropractic teaching clinic. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. 2008;31(6):419-423
54. Pistolesi RA. Risk assessment of neurological and/or vertebrobasilar complications in the pediatric chiropractic patient. *J Vertebr Subluxat Res*. 1998;2(2):77-85
55. Vohra S, Johnston BC, Cramer K, Humphreys K. Adverse events associated with pediatric spinal manipulation: a systematic review [published corrections appear in *Pediatrics*. 2007;120(1):251; and *Pediatrics*. 2007;119(4):867]. *Pediatrics*. 2007;119(1). Available at: www.pediatrics.org/cgi/content/full/119/1/e275
56. Bernstein RM, Cozen H. Evaluation of back pain in children and adolescents. *Am Fam Physician*. 2007;76(11):1669-1676
57. Ruge JR, Sinson GP, McLone DG, Cerullo LJ. Pediatric spinal injury: the very young. *J Neurosurg*. 1988;68(1):25-30
58. Adams D, Amernic H, Humphreys K, Best S, Stein T, Vohra S. A survey of CAM practitioners' knowledge, attitudes, and behaviour regarding children in their practice. Presented at: Pediatric Academic Societies annual meeting; April 29-May 2, 2006; San Francisco, CA. Abstract E-PAS2006;59:5510.41
59. Alanee S, Shukla A. Paediatric testicular cancer: an updated review of incidence and conditional survival from the Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results Database. *BJU Int*. 2009;104(9):1280-1283
60. *Strauts v College of Physicians and Surgeons of BC* (1996), 42 Admin LR (2d) 219, aff'd (1997) 47 Admin LR (2d) 79, 36 B.C.L.R. 106 (CA) (physician providing chelation therapy)
61. Regulated Health Professions Act, 1991, SO 1993, c. 18, s. 27 (controlled acts)
62. College of Chiropractors of Ontario. Communicating a diagnosis/clinical impression. Available at: www.cco.on.ca/site_documents/S-008_Communicating_a_Diagnosis_Clinical_Impression.pdf. Accessed August 19, 2010
63. Canadian Chiropractic Association. Glennerin guidelines (April 1993). Available at: www.chiropracticcanada.ca/en-us/AboutUs/ClinicalPracticeGuidelines/GlenerinGuidelinesApril1993.aspx. Accessed August 19, 2010
64. Hawk C, Schneider M, Ferrance RJ, Hewitt E, Van Loon M, Tanis L. Best practices recommendations for chiropractic care for infants, children and adolescents: results of a consensus process [published correction appears in *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. 2010;33(2):164]. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*. 2009;32(8):639-647
65. Kohn L, Corrigan J, Donaldson M, eds. *To Err Is Human: Building a Safer Health System*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 2000
66. Canadian Patient Safety Institute. Available at: www.patientsafetyinstitute.ca. Accessed November 17, 2009
67. Gilmour J. Patient safety, medical error and tort law: an international comparison 2006. Available at: [http://osgoode.yorku.ca/osgmedia.nsf/0/094676DE3FAD06A5852572330059253C/\\$FILE/FinalReport_Full.pdf](http://osgoode.yorku.ca/osgmedia.nsf/0/094676DE3FAD06A5852572330059253C/$FILE/FinalReport_Full.pdf). Accessed August 18, 2010
68. National Steering Committee on Patient Safety. Building a safer system: a national integrated strategy for improving patient safety in Canadian health care. Available at: http://rcpsc.medical.org/publications/building_a_safer_system_e.pdf. Accessed August 19, 2010

**Complementary and Alternative Medicine Practitioners' Standard of Care:
Responsibilities to Patients and Parents**

Joan Gilmour, Christine Harrison, Leyla Asadi, Michael H. Cohen and Sunita Vohra

Pediatrics 2011;128;S200

DOI: 10.1542/peds.2010-2720J

Updated Information & Services	including high resolution figures, can be found at: http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/128/Supplement_4/S200
References	This article cites 20 articles, 1 of which you can access for free at: http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/128/Supplement_4/S200#BIBL
Subspecialty Collections	This article, along with others on similar topics, appears in the following collection(s): Pharmacology http://www.aappublications.org/cgi/collection/pharmacology_sub Therapeutics http://www.aappublications.org/cgi/collection/therapeutics_sub
Permissions & Licensing	Information about reproducing this article in parts (figures, tables) or in its entirety can be found online at: http://www.aappublications.org/site/misc/Permissions.xhtml
Reprints	Information about ordering reprints can be found online: http://www.aappublications.org/site/misc/reprints.xhtml

American Academy of Pediatrics

DEDICATED TO THE HEALTH OF ALL CHILDREN™



PEDIATRICS®

OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS

Complementary and Alternative Medicine Practitioners' Standard of Care: Responsibilities to Patients and Parents

Joan Gilmour, Christine Harrison, Leyla Asadi, Michael H. Cohen and Sunita Vohra

Pediatrics 2011;128;S200

DOI: 10.1542/peds.2010-2720J

The online version of this article, along with updated information and services, is
located on the World Wide Web at:

http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/128/Supplement_4/S200

Pediatrics is the official journal of the American Academy of Pediatrics. A monthly publication, it has been published continuously since 1948. Pediatrics is owned, published, and trademarked by the American Academy of Pediatrics, 141 Northwest Point Boulevard, Elk Grove Village, Illinois, 60007. Copyright © 2011 by the American Academy of Pediatrics. All rights reserved. Print ISSN: 1073-0397.

American Academy of Pediatrics

DEDICATED TO THE HEALTH OF ALL CHILDREN™

