STOP THE MADNESS

Excited Delirium Syndrome does exist

by Joel A. Johnston

In 2011, I was involved with an International Special Panel Review of Excited Delirium Syndrome (ExDS) for the US-based National Institute of Justice (NIJ). The panel included a diverse group of law enforcement personnel, medical practitioners, and researchers participating as panel members to examine ExDS. What has become clear is that there are tangible steps we can take and protocols we can implement as an emergency response community to reduce the risk of unintended outcomes when these rare circumstances present themselves.

Ever since the Braidwood Commission of Inquiry on Conducted Energy Weapon Use, many politicians, their ministries and law enforcement governing bodies have taken the official position that 'Excited Delirium Syndrome' does not exist. As a result, it is not (and in some cases cannot) be addressed in training – nor is it captured in standardized use of force response reporting.

Some of the Braidwood findings were constructive but others contradicted the body of knowledge on this subject at that time and have been the catalyst for emotionally charged debate across Canada and beyond. This article is an effort to help the reader navigate these muddy waters so as to do your own fact-checking and perhaps better discern between reality and the "mud" of conspiracy theories and media bias.

Braidwood found:

Based on the presentations of psychiatrists, other mental health professionals and emergency medicine physicians, I concluded that:

• Police officers are called upon, with increasing regularity, to deal with emotionally disturbed people who display extreme behaviours, including violence, imperviousness to pain, superhuman strength and endurance, hyperthermia, sweating and perceptual disturbances.

• Such emotionally disturbed people are often at an impaired level of consciousness; may not know who they are or where they are; may be delusional, anxious, or frightened; and may be unable to process or comply with an officer’s commands.

• This cluster of behaviours is not a medical condition or a diagnosis. They are symptoms of underlying medical conditions that, in extreme cases, may constitute a medical emergency.

• The officer’s challenge is not to make a medical diagnosis but to decide how to deal with the observable behaviours, whatever the underlying cause.

• It is not helpful to blame resulting deaths on “Excited Delirium Syndrome,” since this conveniently avoids having to examine the underlying medical condition or conditions that actually caused death, let alone examining whether use of the conducted energy weapon and/or subsequent measures to physically restrain the subject contributed to those causes of death.

• The unanimous view of mental health presenters was that the best practice is to de-escalate the agitation, which can best be achieved through the application of recognized crisis intervention techniques. Conversely, the worst possible response is to aggravate or escalate the crisis, such as by deploying a conducted energy weapon and/or using force to physically restrain the subject. It is accepted that there may be some extreme circumstances, however rare, when crisis intervention techniques will not be effective in de-escalating the crisis, but even then there are steps that officers can take to mitigate the risk of deployment.

Although Braidwood influenced a significant number of inquiries, it wasn’t the final word on this critical medical issue – nor was
as those in *The Globe & Mail* (Jan. 4 2012) and the *Calgary Herald* (Jan. 6 2012), have the capacity to do even more damage in placing already at-risk subjects at even greater risk. They do so by advocating a position of denial, based on ignorance and/or motivated by political expedience. This position— that Excited Delirium Syndrome is a term made up by law enforcement to “distract from the true cause of death and to justify police use of force,” is neither credible nor defensible. Unfortunately, it continues to be perpetuated by those with a variety of other agendas.

The situation would be laughable if there wasn’t so much at stake. Why, in the interest of enabling a safer and more effective approach to dealing with these difficult situations, is it so difficult to consider the notion that this may, in fact, be a “dynamic” in certain law enforcement encounters with the public? Instead the *Globe and Herald* criticize Alberta Provincial Court Judge Heather Lamoureux for recommending that emergency responders be trained to more capably recognize and readily implement a collaborative response in an effort to promote the best possible outcome: saving lives.

**Editorial: Delirious over delirium**

*Copyright The Globe & Mail*

Canada does not need a national delirium over “excited delirium.” This supposed cause of many deaths in police custody, including those involving the use of Tasers, was laid to rest after the exhaustive Braidwood inquiry, following the 2007 death of the Polish immigrant Robert Dziekanski.

Why then has an Alberta judge ruled that Gordon Bowe, tasered and restrained by several officers, died from “excited delirium syndrome”? Why is Judge Heather Lamoureux of Alberta Provincial Court proposing everything from the training of police dispatchers in diagnosing “excited delirium” to the creation of a countrywide “excited delirium” database? “Excited delirium” (overheating and wild behaviour) is a blind alley, not a recognized medical condition. It is a convenient way to avoid tough scrutiny of police practices that may contribute to death.

Mr. Braidwood, a retired appeal court judge, spent two years and oversaw two inquiries, one on the overall safety concerns around the Taser and one on Mr. Dziekanski’s brutal death after being Tasered five times by the RCMP at the Vancouver International Airport. He spoke to experts in emergency medicine, cardiology, electrophysiology, pathology, epidemiology, psychology and psychiatry. Judge Lamoureux did not refer in her seven-page ruling to Mr. Braidwood’s 1,000-plus page reports.

Mr. Braidwood concluded that “excited delirium” is not a medical condition. By contrast, delirium is a recognized cognitive and brain dysfunction that is a symptom of an underlying medical condition. This is not just semantics; it points to the real problem—dealing with a sick individual without killing him.

“It is not helpful to blame resulting deaths on ‘excited delirium,’ since this conveniently avoids having to examine the underlying medical condition or conditions that actually caused death, let alone examining whether use of the conducted energy weapon and/or subsequent measures to physically restrain the subject contributed to those causes of death.”

Mr. Bowe was on cocaine and acting wildly in a dark house. The Taser and heavy-handed restraint by Calgary police may or may not have been justified—though the judge should have questioned “kicks to the side of Mr. Bowe’s body.”

Any policy built around “excited delirium” would be an irrational response to such a death. Judges and policy-makers should read Mr. Braidwood’s reports.

**Editorial: Delirious fatality report**

*Copyright Calgary Herald*

The fatality report into the death of Gordon Bowe adds ammunition to the argument that public inquiries too often become a waste of time and money.

Provincial Court Judge Heather Lamoureux’s recommendations are curious, in that they are almost entirely built around the theory that excited delirium is a legitimate medical condition, an assertion that’s controversial and widely disputed. She concluded Bowe, 40, died as a result of excited delirium syndrome, which she says was brought on by cocaine use and not from the deployment of a Taser gun, used by Calgary police trying to subdue him.

Her nine recommendations in the seven-page report almost deal with developing protocols around excited delirium, treating it as a legitimate condition without reference to the controversy or debate in the medical community. She calls for mandatory training of emergency response workers, police and dispatchers in identifying excited delirium and wants a national database established, where police chiefs across Canada would “record and share information related to death associated with excited delirium.”

There’s another school of thought that warns the controversy and diagnosis of excited delirium is a distraction from the true cause of the medical condition that caused the death and is used to justify use of force by police.

The exhaustive Braidwood inquiry into the Taser death of Polish immigrant Robert Dziekanski heard overwhelming evidence that, while delirium is real, excited delirium is “NOT a valid medical or psychiatric diagnosis.” Moreover, it “provides a convenient post-mortem explanation for in-custody deaths where physical and mechanical restraints and conducted energy weapons were employed.”

Just a year ago, another provincial court judge in Halifax, who presided over an 11-month inquiry and wrote a far more comprehensive 460-page report, to Lamoureux’s seven pages, reached conclusions similar to Braidwood’s.

Provincial Court Judge Anne Derrick rejected excited delirium as the cause of death of a man tasered repeatedly by police. She warned: “This case should sound a loud alarm that resorting to ‘excited delirium’ as an explanation for a person’s behaviour and/or their death may be entirely misguided.”
**ExDS Response Measures**

**IDENTIFY**

Observe, record, and communicate the indicators related to this syndrome – handle primarily as a medical emergency.

(SEE REVERSE SIDE)

**CONTROL**

Control and/or restrain subject as soon as possible to reduce risks related to a prolonged struggle.

**SEDATE**

Administer sedation as soon as possible. Consider calming measures. Remove unnecessary stimuli where possible, including lights/sirens.

**TRANSPORT**

Take to hospital as soon as possible for full medical assessment and/or treatment.

---

**ExDS Indicators**

"Excited Delirium Syndrome," is a medical crisis that may be due to a number of underlying conditions. Subjects can demonstrate some or all of the indicators below in law enforcement settings. More indicators will increase the need and urgency for medical attention.

- Extremely aggressive or violent behavior
- Constant or near constant physical activity
- Does not respond to police presence
- Attracted to destructive or aggressive behavior
- Attracted to bright lights/flashlights
- Naked/inadequately clothed
- Attempted "self-cooling" or hot to touch
- Rapid breathing
- Profuse sweating
- Keening (unintelligible animal-like noise)
- Insensitive to/relentless to pain
- Excessive strength (out of proportion)
- Does not tire despite heavy exertion

---

Excited delirium is not listed in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, the medical community’s bible for diagnosing psychiatric illness. Even an independent report commissioned by the RCMP criticized the term and concluded that it is sometimes used as an excuse to justify using a Taser.

All that aside, asking police officers to diagnose the mental state of an agitated suspect in the midst of a crime scene places too much responsibility on those who are not trained psychiatrists.

**Myth One**

Excited Delirium Syndrome is not a recognized medical term.

In the interest of validation, they continue to repeat that it isn’t in the standard medical or psychiatric reference texts such as the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders – Fourth Edition (DSM-IV) or the World Health Organization’s International Classification of Diseases (ICD-9).

While technically that remains a correct statement, what is inaccurate is the claim that it is still not a medically recognized term. It has gained acceptance in the medical community in recent years. Both the American College of Emergency Physicians (ACEP) and, perhaps as important, the National Association of Medical Examiners (NAME) have recognized it – the very physicians most likely to encounter this phenomenon during pre-mortem and post-mortem. Additionally, the DSM has always had multiple references to delirium and agitation. Similarly, the ICD-9 contains the following codes which match the signs and symptoms of ExDS:

- 296.0DS Manic Excitement
- 293.1J Delirium of Mixed Origin
- 292.81Q Delirium, drug induced
- 292.B1R Delirium, induced by drug
- 307.9AD Agitation
- 780.09E Delirium
- 799.2AM Psychomotor Excitement
- 799.2V Psychomotor Agitation
- 799.2X Abnormal Excitement
Myth Two

Excited Delirium Syndrome is a term made up by law enforcement or Taser International

Excited Delirium Syndrome has consistently been related to deaths from events that never involved the police—many psychiatric in nature. In fact, restraint related deaths of mentally ill patients can be traced back to 1650; more than 100 years before the birth of Sir Robert Peel, the man credited with creating modern policing.

The ExDS phenomenon was further documented in the 1800s by Dr. Luther Bell, primary psychiatrist at the McLean Asylum for the Insane in Massachusetts, as it was observed in the psychiatric setting where people with mental illness and extreme behavioural problems were institutionalized.

By the 1950s these observed problems and behaviours seemed to decline drastically due to the discovery and use of anti-psychotic pharmaceutical therapy. However, with the decline of “mental institutions” in the 1980s these problems began to manifest in the real world, as psychiatric out-patients ceased to self-medicate. This was exacerbated by the dramatic increase in stimulant drug use. This was when police first began encountering ExDS. The term ‘excited delirium’ was coined in 1985 by Dr. C.V. Wetli and Dr. D.A. Fishbain in their publication, “Cocaine-induced psychosis and sudden death in recreational cocaine users.”

Myth Three

Excited Delirium Syndrome is always fatal

North American law enforcement personnel have many years of experience dealing with ExDS subjects. They come to our attention most frequently because of the violent, agitated, destructive, unpredictable, behaviour that they display. In many cases emergency medical services are able to respond and sedate the subject once they have been restrained.

In other cases they respond and successfully treat victims of ExDS-related cardiac arrest. These out-of-hospital subjects would normally be transported into custody or to hospital and have survived. Some flee before law enforcement or emergency medical responders even arrive on scene—some survive and others do not.

Other subjects suffer fatal cardiac arrest with law enforcement and emergency medical responders on scene. Police are sometimes called to hospitals to assist medical staff unable to control subjects exhibiting signs of ExDS so they can be treated—as there can be no treatment without first gaining control. The syndrome has become of increasing concern to emergency physicians and other primary health care professionals, who believe that earlier recognition, intervention and proactive management may result in fewer ExDS-related deaths.

Myth Four

Law enforcement should not be attempting to diagnose a medical condition

There is a distinct difference between an underlying diagnosis and discerning indicators of a condition. It is important to again note that law enforcement use of the term ‘excited delirium’ is not intended to convey a diagnosis.

Police and other pre-hospital personnel have no ability to differentiate between the underlying processes. However they have a critical need to be able to recognize this type of presentation as being different from a goal-oriented, coherent yet violent individual since one requires urgent medical intervention and the other does not. The medical community most affected by ExDS and the interested researchers have recognized the condition, now we as law enforcement and the public need to accept that the phenomenon exists so that we can respond to it appropriately and more effectively. Period.

Myth Five

First responders can de-escalate every situation with words

The notion that first responders (who always operate in non-clinical settings) are capable of achieving “the unanimous view of mental health presenters (at the Braidwood Inquiry) — to de-escalate the agitation through the application of recognized crisis intervention techniques” is naïve and unrealistic.

It appears that recent research has identified a lack of empirical evidence or relevant research into the effectiveness of de-escalation strategies and crisis intervention techniques. The current rush to implement them in training in some Canadian law enforcement circles seems to be being done with the same lack of caution with which police have been accused of doing when
adopting recent force response options. This is where recognizing the syndrome is most critical. Incoherent, irrational people in the midst of a medical crisis that, left unabated, may kill them need to be controlled so that they can be treated as quickly as possible. They are not usually receptive to the communication process. Windows of opportunity for control must be exploited when they first appear — because they may never present again. Police understand the value of crisis intervention techniques and tactics — but understanding when and where to apply them is equally as important as how to apply them.

Myth Six
It is all about police covering up
There is no appetite to define Excited Delirium Syndrome for the purpose of "blaming in-custody deaths on it." The sooner this argument against moving forward is put to rest, the sooner all emergency responders will be able to more safely and effectively deal with the problem. Jurisdictions that have it right on the ExDS issue have made documented saves of people in its throes — situations that may have otherwise resulted in in-custody deaths.

Instead of burying our heads in the sand on this issue, let us move forward and recognize the existence of the state of ExDS, much the way sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS) and acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS) were recognized after much debate — in the interest of saving lives.

The first step is recognition
Without protocols, unintended outcomes cannot improve. Recognition is the first step. There are a number of North American jurisdictions who have taken a proactive approach to dealing with ExDS. The NJJ panel recognized that perhaps the most important aspect of these early and pilot protocols is the cooperative nature of the response and training required to ensure such a response capability exists.

First and foremost, these situations need to be treated as a medical crisis, not a criminal situation. ExDS is a medical problem masquerading as a police call — this changed thinking in some communities has led to the development of innovative cooperative responses. The first response has become a multi-disciplinary effort, not just law enforcement. Some communities have protocols enabling co-ordinated response training with dispatchers, emergency medical personnel (EMS & fire), law enforcement and emergency department medical staff.

A preliminary protocol
The common protocol steps the panel recognized to identify ExDS, rapidly control, sedate and transport to a medical facility — generally adhere to the American College of Emergency Physicians (ACEP) Excited Delirium Task Force white paper report.

While the panel acknowledged response protocols will continue to evolve and improve with experience and research, its consensus is that overall, these response protocols are appropriate. In the long run, they may prove to be insufficient but will likely do no harm. Some jurisdictions have also established documentation procedures for these protocols, not described in the white paper, but which the NJJ panel also recommends:

• Clear identification of ExDS cases based on common signs and symptoms (indicators) of the syndrome;
• Rapid control of the individual with adequate law enforcement personnel;
• Sedation by emergency medical personnel immediately after the subject comes under police control;
• Transport of the subject to a medical facility for follow-up treatment and evaluation; and documenting the case.

While the panel report has provided some clarity on ExDS, research continues into the syndrome, underlying causes and responses. In conjunction, data being collected by some agencies will help provide even more clarity to the syndrome and improve our collective response so that we can save lives as we continue to protect the public we serve.

First and foremost we need to formally recognize the existence of Excited Delirium Syndrome and establish clear protocols for dealing with it. We need to engage in a multi-disciplinary, comprehensive training effort to ensure that a competent, collaborative response to these rare situations is achievable. Best practices have been identified. The choice is ours.
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