

**Section Six**  
**PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF THE REPEAT REVIEW EXERCISE**

6.1 As indicated in the Inquiry's July paper, mindful that differences of approach between review teams could occur, the Inquiry decided to distribute a number of the same sets of case notes across the teams. In all, fifteen sets of notes were reviewed twice, although none of the teams was told they were undertaking a repeat review, nor, by the same token, were they made aware of the grades assigned in the first review.

6.2 Here we compare the grades for overall care; further work is needed to compare the grades on individual aspects of care.

**Figure 12**

**Overall grade of care for fifteen cases, first review and repeat review**

Second Review Case	OVERALL GRADE	
	First Review	Second Review
SR1	4	4
SR2	4	4
SR3	4	4
SR4	3	2
SR5	3	1
SR6	2/3	2
SR7	4	4
SR8	3	3
SR9	3	4
SR10	3	2
SR11	4	4
SR12	4	4
SR13	1	1
SR14	4	3
SR15	2	4

6.3 Of the fifteen cases selected for repeat review eight children were alive and the other seven died within 30 days of their last cardiac surgical procedure.

6.4 In reviewing the scores we separated those cases scoring overall 3 or 4 (care was adequate or different treatment would have made **no** difference to the outcome), from those scoring overall 1 or 2 (different treatment might or would have made a difference to the outcome).<sup>2</sup>

6.5 In nine of the fifteen cases there is complete agreement on overall scores between the teams. When the overall grades are grouped into two (Grade 4 and 3, and Grade 2 and 1) there is agreement in eleven cases. We were particularly struck by the fact that one team which did a repeat review of five cases was in complete agreement with the original team.

<sup>2</sup> The approach of grouping similar grades follows that used by a second review exercise elsewhere - in its fifth annual report, May 1998, The Confidential Enquiry into Still Births and Infant Deaths reported on an exercise to review a second time 113 sets of case notes.