A.49/04/35/J Page: 206

From:

Sent:

07 June 2005 15:20

To:

Andrew Sands

Subject: From Mr A P Walby - re C Roberts

Andrew

I have combined your first two sentences into one with which I hope you will agree.

Regarding your comments at the end of paragraph three - "this was standard fluid therapy at that time. Although I did not prescribe the fluids, I was not aware of a contraindication to their use in this type of situation", could I suggest we leave this out. The issue of what was and is fluid practice remains under debate and 0.18 N saline remains "standard flu therapy" when monitored adequately. I think that the fact that you did not prescribe the fluids is alluded to in the previous sentence of your statement. The issue of a contraindication remains debatable and you are probably not saying f you had been the prescribing doctor you would not have used such fluid. All in all it sounds very defensive and at this stage if you leave comments out it is probably better.

Can you advise (as you have the notes) the details of the "further serum electrolyte result" about which it is not clear from the chart when this was requested or taken. We can check what information the lab have and avoid later enquiries

Peter

9/6/05. Those I Online down to find within 2 surfaces I refund to all 2 surfaces I refund to all a blood of editorially to the newlt report to in holds 2 lines of Parge I.

Come with your reported at that from the valid exity in function can the biochemistry late?

I am checked - their system does not go back as for as this