

BMJ 2003; 327:1459-1461 (20 December), doi:10.1136/bmj.327.7429.1459

Hazardous journey

Parachute use to prevent death and major trauma related to gravitational challenge: systematic review of randomised controlled trials

Gordon C S Smith, professor¹, Jill P Pell, consultant²

¹ Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Cambridge University, Cambridge CB2 2QQ, ² Department of Public Health, Greater Glasgow NHS Board, Glasgow G3 8YU

Correspondence to: G C S Smith gcss2{at}cam.ac.uk

Abstract

Objectives To determine whether parachutes are effective in preventing major trauma related to gravitational challenge.

Design Systematic review of randomised controlled trials.

Data sources: Medline, Web of Science, Embase, and the Cochrane Library databases; appropriate internet sites and citation lists.

Study selection: Studies showing the effects of using a parachute during free fall.

Main outcome measure Death or major trauma, defined as an injury severity score > 15.

Abstract ___ PDF Respond to this article Read responses to this article Alert me when this article is cited Alert me when responses are posted Alert me when a correction is posted View citation map Services Email this article to a friend Find similar articles in BMJ Find similar articles in ISI Web of Science Find similar articles in PubMed Add article to my folders Download to citation manager Read articles citing this article Search for citing articles in: ISI Web of Science (50) Request Permissions Google Scholar Articles by Smith, G. C S Articles by Pell, J. P Articles citing this Article PubMed PubMed Citation Articles by Smith, G. C S Articles by Pell, J. P Related content Other Statistics and Research Methods: descriptions **Related Article**

Results We were unable to identify any randomised controlled trials of parachute intervention.

Conclusions As with many interventions intended to prevent ill health, the effectiveness of parachutes has not been subjected to rigorous evaluation by using randomised controlled trials. Advocates of evidence based medicine have criticised the adoption of interventions evaluated by using only observational data. We think that everyone might benefit if the most radical protagonists of evidence based medicine organised and participated in a double blind, randomised, placebo controlled, crossover trial of the parachute.

Introduction

The parachute is used in recreational, voluntary sector, and military settings to reduce the risk of orthopaedic, head, and soft tissue injury after gravitational challenge, typically in the context of jumping from an aircraft. The perception that parachutes are a successful intervention is based largely on anecdotal evidence. Observational data have shown that their use is associated with morbidity and mortality, due to both failure of the intervention ¹² and iatrogenic complications. In addition, "natural history" studies of free fall indicate that failure to take or deploy a parachute does not inevitably result in an adverse outcome. We therefore undertook a systematic review of randomised controlled trials of parachutes.

Methods

Literature search

We conducted the review in accordance with the QUOROM (quality of reporting of meta-analyses) guidelines. We searched for randomised controlled trials of parachute use on Medline, Web of Science, Embase, the Cochrane Library, appropriate internet sites, and citation lists. Search words employed were "parachute" and "trial." We imposed no language restriction and included any studies that entailed jumping from a height greater than 100 metres. The accepted intervention was a fabric device, secured by strings to a harness worn by the participant and released (either automatically or manually) during free fall with the purpose of limiting the rate of descent. We excluded studies that had no control group.

Definition of outcomes

The major outcomes studied were death or major trauma, defined as an injury severity score greater than 15.6

Meta-analysis

Our statistical apprach was to assess outcomes in parachute and control groups by odds ratios and quantified the precision of estimates by 95% confidence intervals. We chose the Mantel-Haenszel test to assess heterogeneity, and sensitivity and subgroup analyses and fixed effects weighted regression techniques to explore causes of heterogeneity. We selected a funnel plot to assess publication bias visually and Egger's and Begg's tests to test it quantitatively. Stata software, version 7.0, was the tool for all statistical analyses.

Results

Our search strategy did not find any randomised controlled trials of the parachute.

Parachutes reduce the risk of injury after gravitational challenge, but their effectiveness has not been proved with randomised controlled trials

Credit: HULTON/GETTY

Discussion

Evidence based pride and observational prejudice

It is a truth universally acknowledged that a medical intervention justified by observational data must be in want of verification through a randomised controlled trial. Observational studies have been tainted by accusations of data dredging, confounding, and bias. For example, observational studies showed lower rates of ischaemic heart disease among women using hormone replacement therapy, and these data were interpreted as advocating hormone replacement for healthy women, women with established ischaemic heart disease, and women with risk factors for ischaemic heart disease. However, randomised controlled trials showed that hormone replacement therapy actually increased the risk of ischaemic heart disease, indicating that the apparent protective effects seen in observational studies were due to bias. Cases such as this one show that medical interventions based solely on observational data should be carefully scrutinised, and the parachute is no exception.

Natural history of gravitational challenge

The effectiveness of an intervention has to be judged relative to non-intervention. Understanding the natural history of free fall is therefore imperative. If failure to use a parachute were associated with 100% mortality then any survival associated with its use might be considered evidence of effectiveness. However, an adverse outcome after free fall is by no means inevitable. Survival has been reported after gravitation challenges of more than 10 000 metres (33 000 feet). In addition, the use of parachutes is itself associated with morbidity and mortality. This is in part due to failure of the intervention. However, as with all interventions, parachutes are also associated with iatrogenic complications. Therefore, studies are required to calculate the balance of risks and benefits of parachute use.

The parachute and the healthy cohort effect

One of the major weaknesses of observational data is the possibility of bias, including selection bias and reporting bias, which can be obviated largely by using randomised controlled trials. The relevance to parachute use is that individuals jumping from aircraft without the help of a parachute are likely to have a high prevalence of pre-existing psychiatric morbidity. Individuals who use parachutes are likely to have less psychiatric morbidity and may also differ in key demographic factors, such as income and cigarette use. It follows, therefore, that the apparent protective effect of parachutes may be merely an example of the "healthy cohort" effect. Observational studies typically use multivariate analytical approaches, using maximum likelihood based modelling methods to try to adjust estimates of relative risk for these biases. Distasteful as these statistical adjustments are for the cognoscenti of evidence based medicine, no such analyses exist for assessing the presumed effects of the parachute.

The medicalisation of free fall

It is often said that doctors are interfering monsters obsessed with disease and power, who will not be satisfied until they control every aspect of our lives (*Journal of Social Science*, pick a volume). It might be argued that the pressure exerted on individuals to use parachutes is yet another example of a natural, life enhancing experience being turned into a situation of fear and dependency. The widespread use of the parachute may just be another example of doctors' obsession with disease prevention and their misplaced belief in unproved technology to provide effective protection against occasional adverse events.

What is already known about this topic

Parachutes are widely used to prevent death and major injury after gravitational challenge

Parachute use is associated with adverse effects due to failure of the intervention and iatrogenic injury

Studies of free fall do not show 100% mortality

What this study adds

No randomised controlled trials of parachute use have been undertaken

The basis for parachute use is purely observational, and its apparent efficacy could potentially be explained by a "healthy cohort" effect

Individuals who insist that all interventions need to be validated by a randomised controlled trial need to come down to earth with a bump

Parachutes and the military industrial complex

However sinister doctors may be, there are powers at large that are even more evil. The parachute industry has earned

billions of dollars for vast multinational corporations whose profits depend on belief in the efficacy of their product. One would hardly expect these vast commercial concerns to have the bravery to test their product in the setting of a randomised controlled trial. Moreover, industry sponsored trials are more likely to conclude in favour of their commercial product, and it is unclear whether the results of such industry sponsored trials are reliable.

A call to (broken) arms

Only two options exist. The first is that we accept that, under exceptional circumstances, common sense might be applied when considering the potential risks and benefits of interventions. The second is that we continue our quest for the holy grail of exclusively evidence based interventions and preclude parachute use outside the context of a properly conducted trial. The dependency we have created in our population may make recruitment of the unenlightened masses to such a trial difficult. If so, we feel assured that those who advocate evidence based medicine and criticise use of interventions that lack an evidence base will not hesitate to demonstrate their commitment by volunteering for a double blind, randomised, placebo controlled, crossover trial.

Contributors: GCSS had the original idea. JPP tried to talk him out of it. JPP did the first literature search but GCSS lost it. GCSS drafted the manuscript but JPP deleted all the best jokes. GCSS is the guarantor, and JPP says it serves him right.

Funding: None.

Competing interests: None declared.

Ethical approval: Not required.

References


- 1. Belmont PJ Jr, Taylor KF, Mason KT, Shawen SB, Polly DW Jr, Klemme WR. Incidence, epidemiology, and occupational outcomes of thoracolumbar fractures among US Army aviators. *J Trauma* 2001;50: 855-61. [ISI] [Medline]
- 2. Bricknell MC, Craig SC. Military parachuting injuries: a literature review. *Occup Med (Lond)* 1999;49: 17-26. [Medline]
- 3. Lasczkowski G, Hasenfuss S, Verhoff M, Weiler G. An unusual airplane crash—deadly life saver. Unintentional activation of an automated reserve opening device causing airplane accident. *Forensic Sci Int* 2002;125: 250-3. [CrossRef][ISI][Medline]
- 4. Highest fall survived without a parachute. In: Cunningham A. *Guinness world records 2002*. London: Guinness World Records, 2002.
- 5. Moher D, Cook DJ, Eastwood S, Olkin I, Rennie D, Stroup DF, for the QUOROM Group. Improving the quality of reports of meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials: the QUOROM statement. *Lancet* 1999;354: 1896-1900. [CrossRef][ISI][Medline]
- 6. Lossius HM, Langhelle A, Reide E, Pillgram-Larsen J, Lossius TA, Laake P, et al. Reporting data following major trauma and analysing factors associated with outcome using the new Utstein style recommendations. *Resuscitation* 2001;50: 263-72. [CrossRef][ISI][Medline]
- 7. Davey Smith G, Ebrahim S. Data dredging, bias, or confounding. BMJ 2002;325: 1437-8.[Free Full Text]
- 8. Pines A, Mijatovic V, van der Mooren MJ, Kenemans P. Hormone replacement therapy and cardioprotection: basic concepts and clinical considerations. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol* 1997;71: 193-7.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]
- 9. Rossouw JE, Anderson GL, Prentice RL, LaCroix AZ, Kooperberg C, Stefanick ML, et al. Risks and benefits of estrogen plus progestin in healthy postmenopausal women: principal results from the Women's Health Initiative randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2002;288: 321-33.[Abstract/Free Full Text]
- 10. Lee CT, Williams P, Hadden WA. Parachuting for charity: is it worth the money? A 5-year audit of parachute injuries in Tayside and the cost to the NHS. *Injury* 1999;30: 283-7.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]
- 11. Lexchin J, Bero LA, Djulbegovic B, Clark O. Pharmaceutical industry sponsorship and research outcome and quality: systematic review. *BMJ* 2003;326: 1167-70.[Abstract/Free Full Text]

Related Article

Parachute approach to evidence based medicine

Malcolm Potts, Ndola Prata, Julia Walsh, and Amy Grossman BMJ 2006 333: 701-703. [Full Text]

This article has been cited by other articles: (Search Google Scholar for Other Citing Articles)



SSCHUTTES.

Psychiatr. Serv.

Home

L. I. Sederer

The Evidence-Based Practice: Methods, Models, and Tools for Mental Health Professionals

Psychiatr Serv, August 1, 2006; 57(8): 1219 - 1220.

[Full Text] [PDF]



ANN INTERN MED

Home

J. D. Halamka

Health Information Technology: Shall We Wait for the Evidence? Ann Intern Med, May 16, 2006; 144(10): 775 - 776.

[Full Text] [PDF]



J Bone Joint Surg Br

Home

F. T. Horan

Judging the evidence

J Bone Joint Surg Br, December 1, 2005; 87-B(12): 1589 - 1590.

[Full Text] [PDF]



Nephrol Dial Transplant

Home

T. Claus, R. Schmitt, C. Stabroth, F. C. Luft, R. Kettritz, and C. M. Gross Where do we stand with renovascular hypertension?

Nephrol. Dial. Transplant., July 1, 2005; 20(7): 1495 - 1498.

[Full Text] [PDF]



Circulation

Home

A. C. Marshall and J. E. Lock

Leaving Neverland: A Randomized Trial for Coarctation Shows
Pediatric Interventional Cardiology Is Growing Up

Circulation, June 28, 2005; 111(25): 3347 - 3348.

[Full Text] [PDF]



J. R. Soc. Med.

Home

T. J David

Child abuse and paediatrics

J. R. Soc. Med., May 1, 2005; 98(5): 229 - 231.

[Full Text] [PDF]

PEDIATRICS

Pediatrics

Home

K. Schroeter

Stones From a Glass House: In Reply

Pediatrics, April 1, 2005; 115(4): 1116 - 1117.

[Full Text] [PDF]

JASN

J. Am. Soc. Nephrol.

Home

T. Lau, P.-O. Carlsson, P.S. Leung, C. Wolfrum, E. Asilmaz, E. Luca, J.M. Friedman, M. Stoffel, J.C. Verhave, H.L. Hillege, J.G.M. Burgerhof, W.M.T. Janssen, R.T. Gansevoort, G.J. Navis, D. de Zeeuw, P.E. de Jong, and for the PREVEND Study Group

Why Less Diabetes with Blockade of the Renin-Angiotensin System?: Evidence for a Local Angiotensin-Generating System and Dose-Dependent Inhibition of Glucose-Stimulated Insulin Release by Angiotensin II in Isolated Pancreatic Islets. Diabetologia 47: 240-248, 2004

J. Am. Soc. Nephrol., March 1, 2005; 16(3): 567 - 573. [Full Text] [PDF]



Neurology

Home

R. Sankar

Initial treatment of epilepsy with antiepileptic drugs: Pediatric issues

Neurology, November 23, 2004; 63(10_suppl_4): S30 - S39. [Abstract] [Full Text]



Psychosom. Med.

Home

N. J. S. Christenfeld, R. P. Sloan, D. Carroll, and S. Greenland Risk Factors, Confounding, and the Illusion of Statistical Control Psychosom Med, November 1, 2004; 66(6): 868 - 875.

[Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF]



BMJ

Home

J. Doust and C. Del Mar

Why do doctors use treatments that do not work?
BMJ, February 28, 2004; 328(7438): 474 - 475.

[Full Text] [PDF]



JWatch Emergency Med.

Home

Common Sense vs. Evidence-Based Medicine: Lessons from the Parachute

Journal Watch Emergency Medicine, February 17, 2004; 2004(217): 10 - 10.

[Full Text]

Rapid Responses:

Read all Rapid Responses

Uh huh

Joseph E Morales bmj.com, 19 Dec 2003 [Full text]

Parachutes, padded pants and beneficence

Peter Griffiths

bmj.com, 19 Dec 2003 [Full text]

inherently dangerous behaviors

Emily Jane Woo, MD, MPH

bmj.com, 19 Dec 2003 [Full text]

Parachute trials

Allen J Parmet, MD

bmj.com, 19 Dec 2003 [Full text]

Excellent Article for Citation and Debate

Stephen J Véronneau MD

bmj.com, 19 Dec 2003 [Full text]

Isn't that unethical?

Carlos Cuello

bmj.com, 20 Dec 2003 [Full text]

Dr

Zachary T Bloomgarden

bmj.com, 20 Dec 2003 [Full text]

Qualitative Data Collection?

Ashley P Simons-Rudolph

bmj.com, 20 Dec 2003 [Full text]

alternative parachutes

David Brookman

bmj.com, 20 Dec 2003 [Full text]

Social costs need to be considered

Mike Thomas

bmj.com, 20 Dec 2003 [Full text]

Social costs need to be considered

Mike Thomas

bmj.com, 20 Dec 2003 [Full text]

Evidence and practice

Martin J Dumskyj

bmj.com, 22 Dec 2003 [Full text]

Publication bias may explain the (lack of) review's findings

Victor M. Montori

bmj.com, 23 Dec 2003 [Full text]

Anecdotal support for short course of parachute therapy

Robert N C Pfeifer

bmj.com, 24 Dec 2003 [Full text]

Blinding and class effect?

Barry J Lyons

bmj.com, 29 Dec 2003 [Full text]

What is EBM

Aviel Roy-Shapira

bmj.com, 31 Dec 2003 [Full text]

Evidence-based medicine (EBM) or prejudiced based medicine (PBM)?

Sean Lynch, et al.

bmj.com, 31 Dec 2003 [Full text]

Do straw men need parachutes?

Lee A. Green

bmj.com, 1 Jan 2004 [Full text]

On the Value of Evidence for Parachutes

Scott D Ramsey

bmj.com, 21 Jan 2004 [Full text]

Secondary Gain

Terence Silverton

bmj.com, 23 Jan 2004 [Full text]

On the other hand....Type I travails

Jack E. Rosenblatt, M.D.

bmj.com, 26 Jan 2004 [Full text]

Poppycock and rubbish

Richard A. Davidson, MD, MPH

bmj.com, 27 Jan 2004 [Full text]

RCTs

Colin G Gibson

bmj.com, 28 Jan 2004 [Full text]

Evidence-based medicine is not THAT funny

Robert J. Temple, M.D.

bmj.com, 30 Jan 2004 [Full text]

Dedication and rhetoric through chemical imbalance and sleep deprivation

Jason D. Carroll

bmj.com, 2 Feb 2004 [Full text]

Parachutes and medical interventions: An unfair comparison

Rajiv Sarin

bmj.com, 4 Feb 2004 [Full text]

Evidence-base for using insulin to treat diabetics: can it ever be complete?.

Richard G Fiddian-Green

bmj.com, 5 Feb 2004 [Full text]

EBM: A Postmodern Phenomenon

Grace E. Jackson, MD

bmj.com, 22 Feb 2004 [Full text]

Noah's Parachute?

Paul R. Chelminski

bmj.com, 11 Mar 2004 [Full text]

Evidence Base for EBM?

Howard McNulty

bmj.com, 11 May 2004 [Full text]

Flaw in analysis

John Tukey

bmj.com, 7 Aug 2004 [Full text]

Parachutes and male circumcision: any similarity?

Julius Atashili

bmj.com, 15 Oct 2004 [Full text]

Re: Evidence-based medicine is not THAT funny

Larry M. Weisenthal

bmj.com, 24 Nov 2005 [Full text]

Hang Glider Pilot Response

C Williams

bmj.com, 19 Sep 2006 [Full text]

Time to Ponder Over What We Consider Evidence

GS Umamaheswara Rao

bmj.com, 4 Oct 2006 [Full text]

This article
Abstract
PDF
Respond to this article
Read responses to this article
Alert me when this article is cited
Alert me when responses are posted
Alert me when a correction is posted
<mark>] View citation map</mark>
Services
Email this article to a friend
Find similar articles in BMJ
Find similar articles in ISI Web of Science
Find similar articles in PubMed
Add article to my folders
Had at ticle to my folders





© 2003 BMJ Publishing Group Ltd