

**From:** David Bornstein  
**Sent:** Thursday, 2 July 2009 11:10 AM  
**To:** Lowe-Carlus.Denise  
**Subject:** New Comcare guide - submission

As a medical practitioner required to apply and use the guides, can I make the following comments.

1) The guides are based on the AMA system. However, the format of the tables is confusing in the extreme, and I have no doubt errors will and do arise because of this. The format presented in AMA 5 is easier and this makes for uniformity which is easier to learn and apply.

2) PLEASE develop a stand alone guide. A system whereby one constantly has to refer back to a guide to the guides is cumbersome and a waste of time and leads to errors.

3) All comments from stakeholders seem to forget that the guides are a system of compensation, NOT a system of medicine. In this respect the AMA guides, all editions, are unnecessarily complex, and are an attempt to make the impossible possible. Percentage WPI is NOT a medical concept – it is a legal concept for the purpose of apportioning money according to a percentage.

Accordingly the approach taken in the first edition of the Comcare guides was on the right track. It simply needed refining to reflect what the Commonwealth wishes to pay as compensation for specific disorders. The upper extremity section of all editions of the AMA is ridiculous and due primarily to the input of Al Swanson, a particularly aggressive and influential upper limb surgeon in the USA who considered that the upper extremity was “king” and had the influence to impose his will. In point of fact, tables such as 17.33 in AMA 5 for the lower extremity are certainly the correct way to go, and the concerns of the non medical stakeholders can be accommodated within a framework of that description.

In summary, I PLEAD for simplification.

Regards,  
Dr David Bornstein  
Orthopaedic surgeon.