

the ASA score is related to its simplicity. The ASA score has penetrated beyond anesthesia and even beyond human medicine.⁴ It may even be considered on a par with the Apgar score.⁵

We hesitate to support the authors' recommendation to use the examples to the ASA score, instead of using common sense and simple rules. Having a list of examples transforms a simple albeit subjective universal score into a cumbersome one. Keep it simple, stupid (KISS).⁶

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Alexander Avidan, M.D., Carolyn F. Weiniger, M.B., Ch.B. Hadassah – Hebrew University Medical Center, Jerusalem, Israel (A.A.). alex@avidan.co.il

References

1. Hurwitz EE, Simon M, Vinta SR, Zehm CF, Shabot SM, Minhajuddin A, Abouleish AE: Adding examples to the ASA-Physical Status Classification improves correct assignment to patients. *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 2017; 126:614–22
2. ASA Physical Status Classification System. Available at: <https://www.asahq.org/resources/clinical-information/asa-physical-status-classification-system>. Accessed March 14, 2017
3. Sweitzer B: Three wise men (x2) and the ASA-Physical Status Classification System. *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 2017; 126:577–8
4. Zeltzman P: How ASA scores help make anesthesia safer for your pet patients. Available at: <http://www.veterinarypracticenews.com/how-asa-scores-help-make-anesthesia-safer-for-your-pet-patients/>. Accessed March 14, 2017
5. Apgar V: A proposal for a new method of evaluation of the newborn infant. *Curr Res Anesth Analg* 1953; 32:260–7
6. Kiss principle. Available at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/KISS_principle. Accessed March 14, 2017

(Accepted for publication September 28, 2017.)

In Reply:

I thank Drs. Avidan and Weiniger for their comments on my article.¹ Their suggestion and use of the acronym KISS (keep it simple stupid) summarizes the point of my editorial much more succinctly than my two pages. I could not agree more with them that adding nonvalidated examples to a simple, “commonsense” categorization may hobble the time-honored utility and universal use of the American Society of Anesthesiologists (ASA) Physical Status Classification System. I smiled when I saw the veterinary reference in their letter. I had originally referenced a study using the ASA classification in veterinary anesthesia but removed it due to space constraints.² Anesthesiologists need to be extremely cautious before altering a tool as far-reaching and surprisingly robust as the ASA classification in the practice of medicine, even across genera.

Competing Interests

The author declares no competing interests.

BobbieJean Sweitzer, M.D., F.A.C.P., Northwestern University, Chicago, Illinois. bobbie.sweitzer@northwestern.edu

References

1. Sweitzer B: Three wise men (x2) and the ASA-Physical Status Classification System. *ANESTHESIOLOGY* 2017; 126:577–8
2. McMillan M, Brearley J: Assessment of the variation in American Society of Anaesthesiologists Physical Status Classification assignment in small animal anaesthesia. *Vet Anaesth Analg* 2013; 40:229–36

(Accepted for publication September 28, 2017.)

In Reply:

We thank Drs. Avidan and Weiniger for their comments related to our article, “Adding Examples to the ASA-Physical Status Classification Improves Correct Assignment to Patients.”¹ They posit that the addition of objective examples to the previously subjective American Society of Anesthesiologists Physical Status (ASA-PS) Classification System may hinder the universal application of the ASA-PS score by unnecessarily increasing the complexity of the system.

As stated in their letter, “the ASA score has penetrated beyond anesthesia.” It is our belief that this is exactly why the examples *should* be used. With the increasing use of the ASA-PS score by nonanesthesia providers, there are many assigning ASA-PS who do not have the anesthesia-related training to understand the differences between classifications. Although we agree that physician anesthesiologists currently use “common sense” in determining the ASA-PS, the gestalt that many of us have in applying the ASA-PS in practice may not exist for those who do not have experience in anesthesiology. Additionally, poor interrater reliability for the ASA-PS has been shown repeatedly.^{2–4} For these reasons, the ASA-PS examples may ultimately prove more useful for nonanesthesia providers than anesthesia ones. As we demonstrated, with examples there was improvement in correct assignment for anesthesia and nonanesthesia providers with no significant difference in the rate of correct assignment between anesthesia-trained and nonanesthesia clinicians.¹ We reiterate that the examples are guidelines and recognize the list is not comprehensive; the examples should provide a framework indicating the most likely appropriate ASA-PS score for commonly encountered diseases. The final determination of ASA-PS should be made by a physician anesthesiologist. We recognize that until further studies are done, the true effect of these examples in clinical practice is yet to be seen. We agree that uniform application across the board, even with examples, is unlikely, but given the inconsistency that already exists with ASA-PS score assignments, it is hard to argue that an addition with the potential to improve objective scoring should not be used clinically.